A U M

The chest which has the sky for its circumference and the earth for its bottom, does not decay, for the quarters are its sides, and heaven its lid above. That chest is a treasury, and all things are within it.—*Chandogya-Upanishad.*

THEOSOPHY

Vol. IV JULY, 1916 No. 9

No Theosophical Society, as such, is responsible for any opinion or declaration in this magazine, by whomsoever expressed, unless contained in an official document.

Where any article, or statement, has the author's name attached, he alone is responsible, and for those which are unsigned, the Editors will be accountable.

THE BHAGAVAD-GITA

CHAPTER XI.

BY A STUDENT OF W. Q. J.

ENTITLED "Vision of the Divine Form as including All Forms," this chapter, like all the others, is to be applied to the individual, for while many classes of being, with their degrees of consciousness and power, are continually referred to, a clear indication is given that each Divine Ego is primarily the Self, and contains within his being every element that exists in the Universe.

Arjuna begins in this chapter by saying, "My delusion has been dispersed by the words which thou for my soul's peace hast spoken concerning the mystery of the Adhyatma—the Spirit." He had perceived that the One Self animates all forms of every kind; that the sustaining power, as well as the perceiving power is within each and every form; but he desired to see and understand the form or container of Self; in other words, the means by which the One Self became focussed—so to speak—in the innumerable forms of existence.

Krishna in reply gives the key to the answer in one sentence. "*Here in my body* now behold, O Gudakesha, the whole universe animate and inanimate gathered here in one, and all things else thou hast a wish to see. But as with thy natural eyes thou art not able to see me, I will give thee the divine eye." Here, it is evident that the *body* Krishna spoke of was a spiritual one, since it required the divine eye to see it, and that Arjuna could not perceive this highest form unless he himself possessed similar sight. *Body* implies form and substance, and in this relation must mean the highest conceivable primordial matter or substance, which to us might be comprehended as "luminosity and energy", the source of all light and power.

The words "the Divine form as including all forms" imply that there are no forms but those which the Divine form includes, from which it may be understood that the substratum of every form is the same primordial substance spoken of in this chapter as "the divine form", and that every being possesses a divine form which contains within it potentially every power and element. In this ancient teaching is to be found the true basis of evolution, an unfolding from within outwards.

The descriptive portions of this chapter may be better understood if the student will bear in mind that the Gita, as we have it in our language, is a rendition from the Sanscrit,—the latter being a scientific language whose every letter has a numerical value, with a corresponding sound and meaning; whereas our language is that of a fighting and a trading people, with a paucity of terms for anything beyond the physical. One will not then make the mistake of thinking that such descriptions are due to a childish and ignorant imagery, but in reality to a knowledge of powers, forces, beings and states of consciousness.

Sanjaya (the recorder of the dialogue) says, "Hari (Krishna) the mighty Lord of mysterious power, showed to the son of Pritha (Arjuna) his supreme form, with many mouths and eyes and many wonderful appearances, with many divine ornaments, many celestial weapons upraised; adorned with celestial garlands and robes, anointed with celestial ointments and perfumes, full of every marvelous thing, the eternal God whose face is turned in all directions."

"The eternal God" is the Perceiver within the divine form; the "face . . . turned in all directions" is the "divine form", which like a spherical mirror reflects all things. All differentiations of substance occur within the divine form, and each differentiation necessitates its own peculiar modes of expression and appearances, corresponding to "mouths", "eyes", and "wonderful forms".

It has been said of old that "the Deity geometrizes". All forms evolve from within outwards. From the "point" whose center is everywhere and circumference nowhere, a radiation equal in all directions begins, and establishes a circumference; a sphere within which the activity of the "point" is particularly confined. The "point" spreading out horizontally becomes a diameter dividing the sphere into positive and negative hemispheres, forming a basis for action and reaction. A further extension of the point vertically to the circumference divides the sphere into four parts, represented on a plane surface as a cross within the circle. Remembering that these extensions of the "point", or center, are lines of force proceeding from the center and tending to return to it, we can conceive of the beginning of a revolution of the sphere whereby the ends of the vertical and horizontal lines extend towards each other, forming at first the ansated cross, and finally the square within the circle, in reality, a cube or six-sided figure within the

sphere. The cube, if looked at from either side presents the appearance of four angles, which, if we can conceive of them as being luminous points equidistant from the bright center, would be seen as a four-pointed star, the symbol and sign of the animal kingdom. If we can imagine Arjuna as seeing within the "divine form" all living lines of force and the forms produced by them, the four, the five, the six-pointed star, and the many-sided figures, all in motion and of wonderful brilliancy of light and of many colors, presenting the activities of all beings of every grade in the universe, we may obtain some conception of the descriptive parts of this chapter.

"I am Time matured, come hither for the destruction of all these creatures". "Time matured" means the completion of cycles; every thing that begins in time, ends in time; every action has its own cycle or period of return, or re-action; it is action and actions that produce cycles, and these latter range from those of momentary duration to those of a "great age", as they are produced by separate entities, classes of beings, or the collectivity of actions by all beings of every grade concerned in any particular stream of evolution. The general reference here is to the impermanence of all forms or combinations of them. Change is necessitated by progress, for without change there would be stagnation; hence the constant disintegration and re-integration of elements in ever changing relation and form, all brought about by the requirements of the Perceiver—the Real Man within—, who is the sole survivor through all changes.

"Thou art the one indivisible Being, and non-being, that which is supreme". This statement can only be understood by each one applying it to himself. We know that we are not our bodies, for they constantly change, while we remain the same identity through all the changes. We are not our "minds", for we change them whenever we find occasion to do so; if we were our minds we could not change them, and further, it is apparent that "change" cannot see "change"; only that which is permanent can see change. That permanency is the Real, the immortal Man, or, as the "Voice of the Silence" states it, "the Man that was, that is, and will be, for whom the hour shall never strike". Each is the Self, the Perceiver; non-being, yet the cause and sustainer of being; as the Gita states it in this chapter, "thou art the Knower and that which is to be known"; "thou art the final supreme receptacle of this universe"—the garnerer of all experience when this universe is dissolved. At the end of the Great Cycle, which includes all minor cycles, all beings return to the primordial state, plus the experience gained. The next great stream of evolution will proceed on the basis of the acquired knowledge of all beings concerned.

"Having been ignorant of thy majesty, I took thee for a friend, and have called thee 'O Krishna, O Son of Yadu, O friend,' and blinded by my affection and presumption, I have at times treated thee without respect in sport, in recreation, in repose, in thy chair,

and at thy meals, in private and in public; all this I beseech thee, O inconceivable being, to forgive."

Krishna is to be considered as not only representing the Self in all beings, but as a Divine Being embodied in a human form. Arjuna had asked to see the "divine form", and having seen it, was awed by its grandeur and glory, and realized that he had conducted himself towards Krishna as a human being like himself, although of vastly greater learning; he therefore besought forgiveness for his presumption, and asked Krishna to resume the form to which he was accustomed.

Here in this ancient scripture is pictured the fatal error made again and again by mankind in the failure to recognize a divine teacher when he appears among them in human guise. Buddha, Jesus, and many others before and after them, were treated by their contemporaries as ordinary human beings actuated by similar motives as the rest of mankind. They were opposed by the established interests, religious and otherwise, because the doctrines they taught were destructive of the hard and fast conclusions upon which those interests were founded; their speech and acts, although intended to instruct, enlighten, and benefit, were construed as violations of law and custom, and were frequently characterized as criminal in nature. Even among their immediate disciples, suspicion, doubt, jealousy, fear, resentment and self-interest were to be found, none of which could have had existence had the real nature of the teacher been understood. These conditions prevented the true relation between teacher and disciple which is so necessary to the latter if he would benefit fully from that relation. It is true that all the disciples learned something in spite of their defects, but it is also true that the lack of intuitive perception of the divine nature of their teachers was the most important factor in the failure of those disciples to truly transmit the teachings they had received; for that lack closed the door in themselves through which the divine enlightenment could come. Even Arjuna, loyal and devoted disciple as he was, had failed to perceive the wondrous nature of his teacher. It was not until that teacher by his favor and power had caused "the divine eye" in Arjuna to open that the ability to see on that plane of substance was gained. It is natural to suppose that Arjuna had by his unshaken confidence and constant devotion arrived at a stage of development where such help was merited.

It might be well for students of Theosophy to consider whether they may not have made a similar mistake in regard to Those who brought the message of Theosophy to the Western world, and so kept closed the only door through which direct help could come.

In the closing portion of the chapter Krishna says: "I am not to be seen, even as I have shown myself to thee, by study of the Vedas (scriptures), nor by mortifications, nor alms-giving, nor sacrifices. I am to be approached and seen and known in truth by means of that devotion which has me alone as the object".

The following, written by one of the Teachers, may serve as an explanation of the foregoing paragraph. "Ishwara, the spirit in man, is untouched by any troubles, works, fruit of works, or desires, and when a firm position is assumed, with the end in view of reaching union with spirit through concentration, He (that spirit) comes to the aid of the lower self and raises it gradually to higher planes". The "firm position" and concentration are one and the same; it means a life-time's devotion, an acting for and as the Self in all things.

"He whose actions are for me alone, who esteemeth me the supreme goal, who is my servant only, without attachment to the results of action and free from enmity towards any creature, cometh to me, O son of Pandu".

Forum

ABOUT CAPITAL PUNISHMENT*

If we admit the truth of theosophical doctrines regarding the inner constitution of man and his fate after death, what would be the FORUM'S *view as to capital punishment?*

W. Q. Judge.—My view is that capital punishment is both useless and injurious. It is as great an injustice to the world of beings left unexecuted as to the one so violently sent out of life. They used to kill men in England for stealing a ten-penny nail or a loaf of bread, but thieves and thieving did not lessen. Murders have not decreased. In the country districts executions are means for brutalizing the people, who make a hanging an occasion for a gala gathering in order to see a man legally killed. But theosophically it is far worse. The fact that the sudden killing is legal makes no difference with the laws of nature. The man is suddenly cut off from his body, and, just like a suicide, is condemned to be a "spook." He is dead so far as the body is concerned, but is astrally alive. Worse than a suicide he is filled with hate and revenge which he must wreak on some one. At first he is not able to do much, but soon he finds that there are sensitive persons on the earth who can be filled with his vicious and raging passions. These poor souls are then influenced to commit crimes; being filled mentally—from the inner planes—with the ideas and passions of the criminal, they are at last moved to do what their mind is filled with. The executed criminal does not have to know what is going on, for his raging passions, untouched by the executioner, excite and influence of themselves whoever is sensitive to them. This is why many a crime is suddenly committed by weak persons who appear to be carried away by an outside force. It seems hardly possible that anyone could believe in theosophical and occult doctrines and at the same time commend capital punishment.

---

*This answer by Mr. Judge to the question asked was first printed in *The Theosophical Forum* for May, 1895. The title used is our own. [ED. THEOSOPHY.]

TRANSACTIONS OF THE BLAVATSKY LODGE

OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.

DISCUSSIONS OF THE STANZAS OF THE FIRST VOLUME OF THE "SECRET DOCTRINE."

(Continued from June)

The "Transactions" were compiled from shorthand notes taken at the meetings of the Blavatsky Lodge of the Theosophical Society, January 10th to June 20th, 1889, and later printed in pamphlet form. Copies of this pamphlet are getting rarer with every year. THEOSOPHY is therefore reprinting the "Transactions" for the benefit of present-day students. Part I consists of discussions of Stanzas I and II of the *"Book of Dzyan,"* upon which *"The Secret Doctrine"* is based. The answers to the questions were given by H. P. Blavatsky. Students not possessing *"The Secret Doctrine,"* will find that these Stanzas are also printed in H. P. Blavatsky's *"Voice of the Silence,"* which is owned by most students, or can be purchased, through THEOSOPHY, at the nominal price of seventy-five cents, postpaid. The first installment of the "Transactions" was printed in the June issue of THEOSOPHY.

II.

STANZA I. *(continued).*

Sloka (3). . . . UNIVERSAL MIND WAS NOT, FOR THERE WERE NO AH-HI *(celestial beings)* TO CONTAIN *(hence manifest)* IT.

Q. This sloka seems to imply that the Universal Mind has no existence apart from the Ah-hi; but in the Commentary it is stated that:

"During Pralaya the Universal Mind remains as a permanent possibility of mental action, or as that abstract absolute thought of which mind is the concrete relative manifestation, and that the Ah-hi are the vehicle for divine universal thought and will. They are the intelligent forces which give to nature her laws, while they themselves act according to laws imposed upon them by still higher powers, and are the hierarchy of spiritual beings through which the universal mind comes into action."*

The Commentary suggests that the Ah-hi are not themselves the Universal Mind, but only the vehicle for its manifestation.

A. The meaning of this sloka is, I think, very clear; it means that, as there are no finite differentiated minds during Pralaya, it is just as though there were no mind at all, because there is nothing *to contain or perceive it.* There is nothing to receive and reflect the ideation of the Absolute Mind; therefore, *it is not.*

Secret Doctrine references are to the Original Edition.—[ED. THEOSOPHY].
*S. D., I., 38.

Everything outside of the Absolute and immutable Sat (Be-ness), is necessarily finite and conditioned, since it has beginning and end. Therefore, since the "Ah-hi were not," there was no Universal Mind as a manifestation. A distinction had to be made between the Absolute Mind, which is ever present, and its reflection and manifestation in the Ah-hi, who, being on the highest plane, reflect the universal mind collectively at the first flutter of Manvantara. After which they begin the work of evolution of all the lower forces throughout the seven planes, down to the lowest—our own. The Ah-hi are the primordial seven rays, or *Logoi,* emanated from the first Logos, *triple,* yet one in its essence.

Q. Then the Ah-hi and Universal Mind are necessary complements of one another?

A. Not at all: Universal or Absolute Mind always *is* during Pralaya as well as Manvantara; it is immutable. The Ah-hi are the highest Dhyanis, the Logoi as just said, those who begin the downward evolution, or emanation. During Pralaya there are no Ah-hi, because they come into being only with the first *radiation* of the Universal Mind, which, *per se,* cannot be differentiated, and the radiation from which is the first *dawn* of Manvantara. The Absolute is dormant, latent mind, and cannot be otherwise in true metaphysical perception; it is only Its shadow which becomes differentiated in the collectivity of these Dhyanis.

Q. Does this mean that it was absolute consciousness, but is so no longer?

A. It is *absolute consciousness* eternally, which consciousness becomes *relative consciousness* periodically, at every "Manvantaric dawn." Let us picture to ourselves this latent or potential consciousness as a kind of vacuum in a vessel. Break the vessel, and what becomes of the vacuum; where shall we look for it? It has disappeared; it is everywhere and nowhere. It is something, yet *nothing:* a *vacuum,* yet a *plenum.* But what in reality is a vacuum as understood by Modern Science—a homogeneous something, or what? Is not absolute Vacuum a figment of our fancy? A pure negation, a supposed Space where nothing exists? This being so, destroy the vessel, and—to our perceptions at any rate—nothing exists. Therefore, the Stanza puts it very correctly; "Universal Mind was not," because there was no vehicle to contain it.

Q. What are the higher powers which condition the Ah-hi?

A. They cannot be called powers; *power* or perhaps Potentiality would be better. The Ah-hi are conditioned by the awakening into manifestation of the periodical, universal LAW, which becomes successively active and inactive. It is by this law that they are conditioned or formed, not created. "Created" is an impossible term to use in Philosophy.

Q. Then the power or Potentiality which precedes and is higher than the Ah-hi, is the law which necessitates manifestation.

A. Just so; periodical manifestation. When the hour strikes, the law comes into action, and the Ah-hi appear on the first rung of the ladder of manifestation.

Q. But surely this is THE *law and not* A *law?*

A. Precisely, since it is absolute and "Secondless"—therefore it is not an attribute, but that Absoluteness itself.

Q. The great difficulty is to account for this law?

A. That would be trying to go beyond the first manifestation and supreme causality. It will take all our limited intellect to vaguely understand even the latter; try as we may, we can never, limited as we are, approach the Absolute, which is to us, at our present stage of mental development, merely a logical speculation, though dating back to thousands and thousands of years.

Q. With reference to the sloka under discussion, would not "cosmic mind" be a better term than "universal mind"?

A. No; cosmic mind appears at the third stage, or degree, and is confined or limited to the manifested universe. In the Purânas Mahat (the "great" Principle of mind, or Intellect) appears only at the third of the Seven "Creations" or stages of evolution. Cosmic Mind is Mahat, or divine ideation in active (creative) operation, and thus only the periodical manifestation *in time* and *in actu* of the Eternal Universal Mind—*in potentia.* In strict truth, Universal Mind, being only another name for the Absolute, *out of time and Space,* this Cosmic Ideation, or Mind, is not an evolution at all (least of all a "creation"), but simply one of the aspects of the former, which knows no change, which ever was, which is, and will be. Thus, I say again, the sloka implies that universal ideation was not, *i. e.,* did not exist for perception, because there were no minds to perceive it, since Cosmic Mind was still latent, or a mere potentiality. As the stanzas speak of manifestation, we are compelled so to translate them, and not from any other standpoint.

Q. We use the word "cosmic" as applied to the manifested universe in all its forms. The sloka apparently does not refer to this, but to the first absolute Consciousness, or Non-consciousness, and seems to imply that the absolute consciousness could not be that universal mind because it was not, or could not be, expressed: there was, therefore, no expression for it. But it may be objected that though there was no expression for it, still it was there. Can we say that, like Sat, it was and was not?

A. That will not help the interpretation.

Q. When it is said that it was not, the idea conveyed then is that it was not in the Absolute?

A. By no means; simply "it was not."

Q. There seems to be a distinction, certainly; for if we could say "it was," it would be taking a very one-sided view of the idea of Sat, and equivalent to saying that Sat was BEING. *Still, someone may say that the phrase "Universal Mind was not," as it stands, suggests that it is a manifestation, but mind is not a manifestation.*

A. Mind, in the act of ideation, is a manifestation; but Universal Mind is not the same thing, as no conditioned and relative act can be predicted of that which is Absolute. Universal ideation was as soon as the Ah-hi appeared, and continues throughout the Manvantara.

Q. To what cosmic plane do the Ah-hi, here spoken of, belong?

A. They belong to the first, second, and third planes—the last plane being really the starting point of the primordial manifestation—the objective reflection of the unmanifested. Like the Pythagorean *Monas,* the first Logos, having emanated the first triad, disappears into silence and darkness.

Q. Does this mean that the three Logoi emanated from the primordial Radiation in Macrocosm correspond to Atma, Buddhi, and Manas, in the Microcosm?

A. Just so; they correspond, but must not be confounded with them. We are now speaking of the Macrocosm at the first flutter of Manvantaric dawn, when evolution begins, and not of Microcosm or Man.

Q. Are the three planes to which the three Logoi belong simultaneous emanations, or do they evolve one from another?

A. It is most misleading to apply mechanical laws to the higher metaphysics of cosmogony, or to space and time, as we know them for neither existed then. The reflection of the triad in space and time or the objective universe comes later.

Q. Have the Ah-hi been men in previous Manvantaras, or will they become so?

A. Every living creature, of whatever description, was, is, or will become a human being in one or another Manvantara.

Q. But do they in this Manvantara remain permanently on the same very exalted plane during the whole period of the life-cycle?

A. If you mean by "life cycle" a duration of time which extends over fifteen figures, then my answer is most decidedly—no. The "Ah-hi" pass through all the planes, beginning to manifest on the third. Like all other Hierarchies, on the highest plane they are *arupa, i. e.,* formless, bodiless, without any substance, mere breaths. On the second plane, they first approach to Rupa, or form. On the third, they became Manasa-putras, those who became incarnated in man. With every plane they reach they are called by different names—there is a continual differentiation of their original homo-

geneous substance; we call it substance, although in reality it is no substance of which we can conceive. Later, they become Rupa—ethereal forms.

Q. Then the Ah-hi of this Manvantara . . . ?

A. Exist no longer; they have long ago become Planetary, Solar, Lunar, and lastly, incarnating Egos, for, as said, "they are the collective hosts of spiritual beings."

Q. But it was stated above that the Ah-hi did not become men in this Manvantara.

A. Nor do they as the formless "Ah-hi." But they do as their own transformations. The Manvantaras should not be confounded. The fifteen-figure Manvantaric cycle applies to the solar system; but there is a Manvantara which relates to the whole of the objective universe, the Mother-Father, and many minor Manvantaras. The slokas relating to the former have been generally selected, and only two or three relating to the latter given. Many slokas, therefore, have been omitted because of their difficult nature.

Q. Then, on reawakening, will the men of one Manvantara have to pass through a stage corresponding to the Ah-hi stage in the next Manvantara?

A. In some of the Manvantaras, the tail is in the mouth of the serpent. Think over this Symbolism.

Q. A man can choose what he will think about; can the analogy be applied to the Ah-hi?

A. No; because a man has free will and the Ah-hi have none. They are obliged to act simultaneously, for the law under which they must act gives them the impulse. Free will can only exist in a Man who has both mind and consciousness, which act and make him perceive things both within and without himself. The "Ah-hi" are Forces, not human Beings.

Q. But are they not conscious agents in the work?

A. Conscious in as far as they act within the universal consciousness. But the consciousness of the Manasa-putra on the third plane is quite different. It is only then that they become *Thinkers*. Besides, Occultism, unlike modern Science, maintains that every atom of matter, when once differentiated, becomes endowed with *its own* kind of Consciousness. Every *cell* in the human body (as in every animal) is endowed with its own peculiar discrimination, instinct, and, speaking relatively, with intelligence.

Q. Can the Ah-hi be said to be enjoying bliss?

A. How can they be subject to bliss or non-bliss? Bliss can only be appreciated, and becomes such when suffering is known.

Q. But there is a distinction between happiness and bliss.

A. Granting that there may be, still there can be neither happiness nor bliss without a contrasting experience of suffering and pain.

Q. But we understand that bliss, as the state of the Absolute, was intended to be referred to.

A. This is still more illogical. How can the Absolute be said to *feel?* The Absolute can have no condition nor attribute. It is only that which is finite and differentiated which can have any feeling or attitude predicated of it.

Q. Then the Ah-hi cannot be said to be conscious intelligences, when intelligence is so complex?

A. Perhaps the term is erroneous, but owing to the poverty of European languages there seems to be no other choice.

Q. But perhaps a phrase would represent the idea more correctly? The term seems to mean a force which is a unity, not a complex action and reaction of several forces, which would be implied by the word "intelligence". The noumenal aspect of phenomenal force would perhaps better express the idea.

A. Or perhaps we may represent to ourselves the idea as a flame, a unity; the rays from this flame will be complex, each acting in its own straight line.

Q. But they only become complex when they find receptacles in lower forms.

A. Just so; still the Ah-hi are the flame from which the rays stream forth, becoming more and more differentiated as they fall deeper into matter, until they finally reach this world of ours, with its teeming millions of inhabitants and sensuous beings, and then they become truly complex.

Q. The Ah-hi, then, considered as a primary essence, would be unity? Can we regard them as such?

A. You may; but the strict truth is that they only proceed from unity, and are the first of its seven rays.

Q. Then can we call them the reflection of unity?

A. Are not the prismatic rays fundamentally one single white ray? From the one they become three; from the three, seven; from which seven primaries they fall into infinitude. Referring back to the so-called "consciousness" of the Ah-hi, that consciousness cannot be judged by the standard of human perceptions. It is on quite another plane.

Q. "During deep sleep, mind is not on the material plane"; is it therefore to be inferred that during this period mind is active on another plane? Is there any definition of the characteristics which distinguish mind in the waking state from mind during the sleep of the body?

A. There is, of course; but I do not think that a discussion upon it would be pertinent or useful now; suffice to say that often the reasoning faculty of the higher mind may be asleep, and the instinctual mind be fully awake. It is the physiological distinction between the cerebrum and the cerebellum; the one sleeps and the other is awake.

Q. What is meant by the term instinctual mind?

A. The instinctual mind finds expression through the cerebellum, and is also that of the animals. With man during sleep the functions of the cerebrum cease, and the cerebellum carries him on to the Astral plane, a still more unreal state than even the waking plane of illusion; for so we call this state which the majority of you think so real. And the Astral plane is still more deceptive, because it reflects indiscriminately the good and the bad, and is so chaotic.

Q. The fundamental conditions of the mind in the waking state are space and time: do these exist for the mind (Manas) during the sleep of the physical body?

A. Not as we know them. Moreover, the answer depends on which *Manas* you mean—the higher or the lower. It is only the latter which is susceptible of hallucinations about space and time; for instance, a man in the dreaming state may live in a few seconds the events of a lifetime.* For the perceptions and apprehensions of the Higher Ego there is neither space nor time.

Q. Manas is said to be the vehicle of Buddhi, but the universal mind has been spoken of as a Maha-Buddhi. What then is the distinction between the terms Manas and Buddhi, employed in a universal sense, and Manas and Buddhi as manifested in man?

A. Cosmic Buddhi, the emanation of the Spiritual Soul *Alaya,* is the vehicle of Mahat only when that Buddhi corresponds to Prakriti. Then it is called Maha-Buddhi. This Buddhi differentiates through seven planes, whereas the Buddhi in man is the vehicle of Atman, which vehicle is of the essence of the highest plane of Akasa and therefore does not differentiate. The difference between Manas and Buddhi in man is the same as the difference between the Manasa-Putra and the Ah-hi in Kosmos.

Q. Manas is mind, and the Ah-hi, it is said, can no more have any individual Mind, or that which we call mind, on this plane than Buddhi can. Can there be Consciousness without Mind?

A. Not on this plane of matter. But why not on some other and higher plane? Once we postulate a Universal Mind, both the brain, the mind's vehicle, and Consciousness, its faculty, must be quite different on a higher plane from what they are here. They are nearer to the *Absolute* ALL, and must therefore be represented by a substance infinitely more homogeneous; something *sui generis,* and entirely beyond the reach of our intellectual perceptions. Let us call or imagine it an incipient and incognizable state of primeval differentiation. On that higher plane, as it seems to me, Mahat—the great *Manvantaric* Principle of Intelligence—acts as a Brain, through which the Universal and Eternal Mind radiates the Ah-hi, representing the resultant Consciousness or ideation. As the shad-

* See the discussion on dreams appended to the first number of the "TRANSACTIONS." [Will be reprinted later.—ED. THEOSOPHY.]

ow of this primordial *triangle* falls lower and lower through the descending planes, it becomes with every stage more material.

Q. It becomes the plane on which Consciousness perceives objective manifestations. Is it so?

A. Yes. But here we come face to face with the great problem of Consciousness, and shall have to fight Materialism. For what is Consciousness? According to modern Science it is a faculty of the Mind like volition. We say so, too; but add that while Consciousness is not a thing *per se*, Mind is distinctly—in its Manvantaric functions at least—an Entity. Such is the opinion of all the Eastern Idealists.

Q. It is, however, the fashion nowadays to speak slightingly of the idea that the mind is an entity.

A. Nevertheless, mind is a term perfectly synonymous with Soul. Those who deny the existence of the latter will of course contend that there is no such thing as consciousness apart from brain, and at death consciousness ceases. Occultists, on the contrary, affirm that consciousness exists after death, and that then only the real consciousness and freedom of the Ego commences, when it is no longer impeded by terrestrial matter.

Q. Perhaps the former view arises from limiting the meaning of the term "consciousness" to the faculty of perception?

A. If so, occultism is entirely opposed to such a view.

Sloka (4). THE SEVEN WAYS TO BLISS *(Moksha or Nirvana)* WERE NOT.* THE GREAT CAUSES OF MISERY *(Nidâna and Maya)* WERE NOT, FOR THERE WAS NO ONE TO PRODUCE AND GET ENSNARED BY THEM.

Q. What are the seven ways to bliss?

A. They are certain faculties of which the student will know more when he goes deeper into occultism.

Q. Are the Four Truths of the Hinayâna School the same as those mentioned by Sir Edwin Arnold in "The Light of Asia"; the first of which is the Path of Sorrow; the second of Sorrow's cause: the third of Sorrow's ceasing; and the fourth is the Way?

A. All this is theological and exoteric, and to be found in all the Buddhist scriptures; and the above seems to be taken from Singhalese or Southern Buddhism. The subject, however, is far more fully treated of in the Aryasanga School. Still even there the four truths have one meaning for the regular priest of the Yellow Robe, and quite another for the real Mystics.

Q. Are Nidâna and Maya (the great causes of misery) aspects of the Absolute?

A. Nidâna means the concatenation of cause and effect; the twelve Nidânas are the enumeration of the chief causes which pro-

*Vide *The Voice of the Silence;* Fragment III., *The Seven Portals.*

duce the severest reaction or effects under the Karmic law. Although there is no connection between the terms Nidâna and Maya in themselves, Maya being simply illusion, yet if we consider the universe as Maya or illusion, then certainly the Nidânas, as being moral agents in the universe, are included in Maya. It is Maya, illusion or ignorance, which awakens Nidânas; and the cause or causes having been produced, the effects follow according to Karmic law. To take an instance: we all regard ourselves as Units, although essentially we are one indivisible Unit, drops in the ocean of Being, not to be distinguished from other drops. Having then produced this cause, the whole discord of life follows immediately as an effect; in reality it is the endeavour of nature to restore harmony and maintain equilibrium. It is this sense of separateness which is the root of all evil.

Q. Perhaps it would therefore be better to separate the two terms, and state whether Maya is an aspect of the Absolute?

A. This can hardly be so, since Maya is the Cause, and at the same time an aspect, of differentiation, if of anything. Moreover, the Absolute can never be differentiated. Maya is a manifestation; the Absolute can have no manifestation, but only a reflection, a shadow which is radiated periodically from it—not *by* it.

Q. Yet Maya is said to be the Cause of manifestation or differentiation?

A. What of that? Certainly if there were no Maya there would be no differentiation, or, rather, no objective universe would be perceived. But this does not make of it an aspect of the Absolute, but simply something coeval and coexistent with the manifested Universe or the heterogeneous differentiation of pure Homogeneity.

Q. By a parity of reason, then, if no differentiation, no Maya? But we are speaking of Maya now as THE CAUSE *of the Universe, so that the moment we get behind differentiation, we may ask ourselves—Where is Maya?*

A. Maya is everywhere, and in every *thing* that has a beginning and an end; therefore, every *thing* is an *aspect* of that which is eternal, and in that sense, of course Maya itself is an aspect of SAT, or that which *is* eternally present in the universe, whether during Manvantara or Mahapralaya. Only remember that it has been said of even Nirvâna that it is only Maya when compared with the Absolute.

Q. Is then Maya a collective term for all manifestations?

A. I do not think this would explain the term. Maya is the perceptive faculty of every Ego which considers itself a Unit separate from, and independent of, the One infinite and eternal SAT, or "be-ness." Maya is explained in *exoteric* philosophy and the Purânas, as the personified active Will *of the Creative God*—the latter being but a personified *Maya* himself—a passing deception

of the senses of man, who began anthropomorphizing pure abstraction from the beginning of his speculations. Maya, in the conception of an orthodox Hindu, is quite different from the Maya of a Vedantin Idealist or an Occultist. The Vedanta states that Maya, or the deceptive influence of illusion alone, constitutes belief in the *real* existence of matter or anything differentiated. The Bhagavata Purâna identifies Maya with Prakriti (manifested nature and matter). Do not some advanced European metaphysicians, such as Kant, Schopenhauer, and others, assert the same? Of course they got their ideas about it from the East—especially from Buddhism; yet the doctrine of the unreality of this Universe has been pretty correctly worked out by our philosophers—on general lines, at any rate. Now, although no two people can see things and objects in exactly the same way, and that each of us sees them in his own way, yet all labour more or less under illusions, and chiefly under the great illusion (Maya) that they are, as personalities, distinct beings from other beings, and that even their *Selves* or Egos will prevail in the eternity (or sempiternity, at any rate) as such; whereas not only we ourselves, but the whole visible and invisible universe, are only a temporary part of the one beginningless and endless WHOLE, or that which ever was, is, and will be.

Q. The term seems to apply to the complex points of differentiation: differentiation applying to the unit and Maya to the collection of units. But we may now put a side question.

With regard to the preceding part of the discussion, reference has been made to the cerebrum and cerebellum, and the latter described as the instinctual organ. An animal is supposed to have an instinctive mind; but the cerebellum is said to be simply the organ of vegetative life, and to control the functions of the body alone; whereas the sensual mind is the mind into which the senses open, and there can be no thought or ideation, nothing of which we predicate intellect or instinct anywhere, except in that part of the brain assigned to such functions, namely, the cerebrum.

A. However that may be, this cerebellum is the organ of instinctual animal functions, which reflect themselves in, or produce, dreams which for the most part are chaotic and inconsequent. Dreams, however, which are remembered, and present a sequence of events, are due to the vision of the higher Ego.

Q. Is not the cerebellum what we may call the organ of habit?

A. Being instinctual, it may very well be called so, I believe.

Q. Except that habit may be referred to what we may call the present stage of existence, and instinct to a past stage.

A. Whatever the name may be, the cerebellum alone—as you were already told *(vide "On Dreams," Appendix)*—functions during sleep, not the cerebrum; and the dreams, or emanations, or instinctive feelings, which we experience on waking, are the result of such activity.

Q. The consecutiveness is brought about entirely by the co-ordinating faculty. But surely the cerebrum also acts, a proof of which is that the nearer we approach the sleep-waking state the more vivid our dreams become.

A. Quite so, *when* you are waking; but not before. We may compare this state of the cerebellum to a bar of metal, or something of the same nature, which has been heated during the day and emanates or radiates heat during the night; so the energy of the brain radiates unconsciously during the night.

Q. Still we cannot say that the brain is incapable of registering impressions during sleep. A sleeping man can be awakened by a noise, and when awake will be frequently able to trace his dream to the impression caused by the noise. This fact seems to prove conclusively the brain's activity during sleep.

A. A mechanical activity certainly; if under such circumstances there is the slightest perception, or the least glimpse of the dream state, memory comes into play, and the dream can be reconstructed. In the discussion on dreams, the dream state passing into the waking state was compared to the embers of a dying fire; we may very well continue the simile, and compare the play of the memory to a current of air re-kindling them. That is to say that the waking consciousness recalls to activity the cerebellum, which was fading below the threshold of consciousness.

Q. But does the cerebellum ever cease functioning?

A. No; but it is lost in the functions of the cerebrum.

Q. That is to say that the stimuli which proceed from the cerebellum during waking life fall below the threshold of waking consciousness, the field of consciousness being entirely occupied by the cerebrum, and this continues till sleep supervenes, when the stimuli from the cerebellum begin in their turn to form the field of consciousness. It is not, therefore, correct to say that the cerebrum is the only seat of consciousness.

A. Quite so; the function of the cerebrum is to polish, perfect, or co-ordinate ideas, whereas that of the cerebellum produces conscious desires, and so on.

Q. Evidently we have to extend our idea of consciousness. For instance, there is no reason why a sensitive plant should not have consciousness. Du Prel, in his "Philosophie der Mystik," cites some very curious experiments showing a kind of local consciousness, perhaps a kind of reflex connection. He even goes further than this, demonstrating, from a large number of well authenticated cases, such as those of clairvoyants, who can perceive by the pit of the stomach, that the threshold of consciousness is capable of a very wide extension, far wider than we are accustomed to give to it, both upwards and downwards.

A. We may congratulate ourselves on the experiments of Du Prel as an antidote to the theories of Professor Huxley, which are absolutely irreconcileable with the teachings of occultism.

ON THE FUTURE: A FEW REFLECTIONS*

ALTHOUGH I am an American citizen, the place of my birth was in Ireland, and in what I am about to say I cannot be accused of Columbiamania, for no matter how long might be my life I could never be an American. For that perhaps it is right, since it is compulsory, to wait for some distant incarnation.

Now, either H. P. B. was right or she was wrong in what she says in the *Secret Doctrine* about the future of America. If wrong, then all this may be dismissed as idle speculation. But, if right, then all thoughtful Theosophists must take heed, weigh well, mentally appropriate and always remember what are her words as well as the conclusions to which they lead.

In the first pages of the second volume she speaks of five great Continents. *First,* the Imperishable Sacred Land [this is at the North Pole, *W. Q. J.*]; *second,* the Hyperborean, now part of it is in Northern Asia; *third,* Lemuria, sunk long ago, but leaving some remains, islands, the points of high mountain ranges; *fourth,* Atlantis, presumably in the Atlantic Ocean, now below the level of the water, but with perhaps Teneriffe and Atlas as reminders; and *fifth,* "was America."

From a survey of the book, digging in notes and culling from the text here and there, the conclusion is irresistible that, although the present America is not the actual Continent as *it is to be,* it is a portion of it; and certainly is now the nursery for the race that will in the future occupy the *sixth* Continent, which for the sixth Great Root-Race will emerge from the waters. Where? Perhaps when the present America has been split up by tremendous cataclysms, leaving here and there large pieces on its western side, it is in the Pacific Ocean that the great mass of the new one will come up from the long sleep below the sea. Rightly then will the great far western ocean have been named *Pacific,* for that Race will not be given to contest nor hear of wars or rumours of war, since it will be too near the seventh, whose mission it must be to attain to the consummation, to seize and hold the Holy Grail.

Turn to page 444[1] and onward of the second volume. Read there that the Americans have become in only three hundred years a primary race *pro tem.*, in short, the germs of the sixth sub-race, to blossom in a few more centuries into the pioneers of that one which must succeed to the present European fifth sub-race in all its characteristics. Then after about 25,000 years, which you will note is meant for a great sidereal cycle of a little over that length of time, this new race will prepare for the seventh sub-race. Cataclysms will then fall upon you; lands and nations will be swept

* This article was first printed in *Lucifer* for March, 1892.

[1] Original Edition; Page 464, New Edition.—[Ed. Theosophy].

away, first of all being the European, including the British Isles—if not gone before—and then parts of both North and South America. And how puny, mongrel, indeed, will be the remains of the scientists of to-day, great masters of microbes now, but then to be looked upon as strange remains of the Nineteenth Century, when, as the people will tell each other then, so many, with Truth before them, laughed at it and stoned its apostles, dancing a fantastic dance meanwhile around the altar of invisible matter.

It seems as if some power, deliberately planning, had selected North and South America for the place where a new primary root-race should be begun. These two continents were evidently the seats of ancient races and not the habitat of wild undeveloped men. The red man of the Northern one has all the appearance and beliefs of a once great race. He believes in one God, a Devachan of happy hunting after death. Some tribes have diagrams of how the world was formed and peopled, that strangely resemble the Hindû cosmogony, and their folk-lore bears deep marks of having come down from an older and better time. Following the course of exploration southwards, we find accumulating evidences all the way of a prior civilization now gone with the cyclic wave which brought it up. Central America is crowded with remains in stone and brick; and so on south still we discover similar proofs. In course of time these continents became what might be called arable land, lying waiting, recuperating, until the European streams of men began to pour upon it. The Spanish overflowed South America and settled California and Mexico; the English, French, and Spanish took the North, and later all nations came, so that now in both continents nearly every race is mixed and still mixing. Chinese even have married women of European blood; Hindûs are also here; the ancient Parsî race has its representatives; the Spanish mixed with the aborigines, and the slaveholders with the Africans. I doubt not but that some one from every race known to us has been here and has left, within the last two hundred years, some impression through mixture of blood.

But the last remnants of the fifth Continent, America, will not disappear until the new race has been some time born. Then a new Dwelling, the sixth Continent, will have appeared over the waters to receive the youth who will tower above us as we do above the pigmies of Africa. But no America as we now know it will exist. Yet these men must be the descendants of the race that is now rising here. Otherwise our philosophy is all wrong. So then, in America now is forming the new sub-race, and in this land was founded the present Theosophical Society: two matters of great importance. It was to the United States, observe, that the messenger of the Masters came, although Europe was just as accessible for the enterprise set on foot. Later, this messenger went to India and then to Europe, settling down in the British Isles. All of this is of importance in our reflections. For why in America at first does she begin the movement, and why end her part of it in Eng-

land? One might be led to ask why was not an effort made at all costs to give the last impulse outwardly in the land of promise where she began the work?

Do not imagine for one moment, O ye English brothers of mine, that London was selected for this because the beauties of your island called her, or for that she had decided at the finish that after all a mistake had been made in not going there first. It was all out of stern necessity, with a wisdom derived from many older heads, having in view the cycles as they sweep resistlessly forward. The point where the great energy is started, the centre of force, is the more important, and not the place at which it is ended. And this remains true, no matter how essential the place of ending may be in the scheme. What, do you suppose India is not as important? and would not that land have offered seemingly a better spot than all for the beginning of the *magnum opus?* Adepts do not make mistakes like that.

America's discovery is ascribed to Christopher Columbus. Although it is doubted, yet no one doubts that the Spanish people did the most at first in peopling it, meanwhile working off some old and making some new Karma, by killing many of the aborigines. Thus it is that doomed people rush on to their doom, even as the troops of insects, animals and men were seen by Arjuna to rush into Krishna's flaming mouths. But later came the sturdy stock from England, who, in the greatest nation, the most enduring on this continent, have left their impress indelibly in the people, in its laws, in its constitution, its customs, its literature and language. Perhaps England and Ireland are the gateways for the Egos who incarnate here in the silent work of making a new race. Maybe there is some significance in the fact that more lines of steamships conveying human freight come to the United States from England, passing Ireland on the way as the last seen land of the old world, than from anywhere else. The deeds of men, the enterprises of merchants, and the wars of soldiers all follow implicitly a law that is fixed in the stars, and while they copy the past they ever symbolize the future.

Did H. P. B. only joke when she wrote in her book that Ireland is an ancient Atlantean remnant, and England a younger Isle, whose rising from the sea was watched by wise men from Erin's shore? Perhaps the people of that old land may have an important influence in the new race of America. It would appear from comparison that they might have had, and probably will in the future. Perhaps, politically, since many expect social disturbances in America. In such a case any student of character will admit that the Irish, ignorant or not, will stand for law and order—for her sons are not battling here with an ancient foe. Why, too, by strange freak of fate is the great stone of destiny in Westminster Abbey fixed under the coronation chair on which the Queen was crowned? Let us also be informed if there be any finger-shadow pointing to the future in the fact that England's Queen, crowned over that

stone,[1] is Empress of India, from which we claim the Aryans came, and where their glorious long-forgotten knowledge is preserved? Her name is Victory. It is the victory for "the new order of Ages"; and that new order began in America, its advent noted and cut on the as yet unused obverse side of the present seal of the United States Government. A victory in the union of the Egos from East and West; for England stretches one hand over to the home of the new race, which she can never own, with the other governing India, and completes the circuit. It may be a fleeting picture, perhaps to be wiped out for a while in a stream of blood, but such is the way the cycles roll and how we may learn to read the future. For England's destiny is not complete, nor has the time struck. None of us hug foolish delusions too long, and even if Ireland were once a most sacred place, that is no reason why we should want to go there. For in America those whose Karma has led them there will work for the same end and brotherhood as others left in India and Europe. The dominant language and style of thought in America is English, albeit transforming itself every day. It is there that silently the work goes on; there European fathers and mothers have gone, establishing currents of attraction that will inevitably and unceasingly draw into reïncarnation Egos similar to themselves. And the great forward and backward rush is completed by the retarded Egos as they die out of other nations, coming meanwhile into flesh again among the older races left behind.

* * * * * * * *

At least such seemed the view while the clouds lifted—and then once more there was silence.

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE, F. T. S.

---

no

WORDS FROM THE "BOOK OF FRIENDLY INSTRUCTION"*

[*From the Sanskrit.*]

Let the wise think on wisdom as unfading and immortal; let him fulfil his duty as though Death grasped him by the hair.

The shadow of a cloud, the favour of the base, new corn, a bouquet, these last only a little time; so it is with youth and riches.

In this world, fugitive as tempest-driven waves, death for another is a rich prize earned by virtue in a former birth.

Unenduring are youth, beauty, life, wealth, lordship, the society of the beloved; let not the wise be deluded by these.

---

[1] It is an interesting fact that in India there is an important ceremony called "mounting the stone."

* This article was first printed by H. P. Blavatsky in *Lucifer* for September, 1888.

THE BABEL OF MODERN THOUGHT*

"O ye Lords of Truth who are cycling in eternity . . . save me from the annihilation in this Region of the *Two Truths*."
—*Egyptian "Ritual of the Dead."*

I.

THAT the world moves in cycles, and events repeat themselves therein, is an old, yet ever new truism. It is new to most, firstly, because it belongs to a distinct group of occult aphorisms *in partibus infidelium,* and our present-day Rabbis and Pharisees will accept nothing coming from *that* Nazareth; secondly, because those who will swallow a camel of whatever size, provided it hails from orthodox or accepted authorities, will strain and kick at the smallest gnat, if only its buzz comes from theosophical regions. Yet this proposition about the world cycles and ever-recurring events, is a very correct one. It is one, moreover, that people could easily verify for themselves. Of course, the people meant here are men who do their own thinking; not those others who are satisfied to remain, from birth till death, pinned, like a thistle fastened to the coat-tail of a country parson, to the beliefs and thoughts of the goody-goody majority.

We cannot agree with a writer (was it Gilpin?) who said that the grandest truths are often rejected, "not so much for want of direct evidence, as for want of inclination to search for it". This applies but to a few. Nine-tenths of the people will reject the most overwhelming evidence, even if it be brought to them without any trouble to themselves, only because it happens to clash with their personal interests or prejudices; especially if it comes from unpopular quarters. We are living in a highly moral atmosphere, high sounding—in words. Put to the test of practice, however, the morality of this age in point of genuineness and reality is of the nature of the black skin of the "negro" minstrel: assumed for show and pay, and washed off at the close of every performance. In sober truth, our opponents—advocates of official science, defenders of orthodox religion, and the *tutti quanti* of the detractors of Theosophy—who claim to oppose our works on grounds of *scientific* "evidence", "public good and truth", strongly resemble advocates in our courts of law—miscalled of justice. These in their defence of robbers and murderers, forgers and adulterers, deem it to be their duty to browbeat, confuse and bespatter all who bear witness against their clients, and will ignore, or if possible, suppress, all evidence which goes to incriminate them. Let ancient Wisdom step into the witness-box herself, and prove that the goods found in the possession of the prisoner at the bar, were taken from her own strong-box; and she will find herself accused of all manner of crimes, fortunate if she escape being branded as a common fraud, and told that she is no better than she should be.

*This article was first printed by H. P. Blavatsky in *Lucifer* for January, 1891.

What member of our Society can wonder then, that in this our age, pre-eminently one of shams and shows, the "theosophists'" *teachings* so (mis-) called, seem to be the most unpopular of all the systems now to the fore; or that materialism and theology, science and modern philosophy, have arrayed themselves in holy alliance against theosophical studies—perhaps because all the former are based on chips and broken-up fragments of that primordial system. Cotton complains somewhere, that the "metaphysicians have been learning their lesson for the last four (?) thousand years", and that "it is now high time that they should begin to teach something". But, no sooner is the possibility of such studies offered, with the complete evidence into the bargain that they belong to the oldest doctrine of the metaphysical philosophy of mankind, than, instead of giving them a fair hearing at least, the majority of the complainers turn away with a sneer and the cool remark: "Oh, you must have invented all you say yourself!"

Dear ladies and gentlemen, has it ever occurred to you, how truly grand and almost *divine* would be that man or woman, who, at this time of the life of mankind, could invent anything, or discover that which had not been invented and known ages before? The charge of being such an inventor would only entitle the accused to the choicest honours. For show us, if you can, that mortal who in the historical cycle of our human race has taught the world something entirely new. To the proud pretentions of this age, Occultism—the real Eastern Occultism, or the so-called Esoteric Doctrine—answers through its ablest students: Indeed all your boasted knowledge is but the reflex action of the by-gone Past. At best, you are but the modern popularisers of very ancient ideas. Consciously and unconsciously you have pilfered from old classics and philosophers, who were themselves but the superficial recorders —cautious and incomplete, owing to the terrible penalties for divulging the secrets of initiation taught during the mysteries—of the primæval Wisdom. Avaunt! your modern sciences and speculations are but the *réchauffé* dishes of antiquity; the dead bones (served with a *sauce piquante* of crass materialism, to disguise them) of the intellectual repasts of the gods. Ragon was right in saying in his *Maçonnerie Occulte,* that "Humanity only *seems* to progress in achieving one discovery after the other, as in truth, it only finds that which it had lost. Most of our modern inventions for which we claim such glory, are, after all, things people were acquainted with three and four thousand years back.* Lost to us through wars, floods and fire, their very existence became obliterated from the memory of man. And now modern thinkers begin to *rediscover* them once more."

Allow us to recapitulate a few of such things and thus refresh your memory.

Deny, if you can, that the most important of our present sciences were known to the ancients. It is not Eastern literature

*The learned Belgian Mason would be nearer the mark by adding a few more ciphers to his four thousand years.

only, and the whole cycle of those esoteric teachings which an over-zealous Christian Kabalist, in France, has just dubbed "the *accursed* sciences"—that will give you a flat denial, but profane classical literature, as well. The proof is easy.

Are not physics and natural sciences but an amplified reproduction of the works of Anaxagoras, of Empedocles, Democritus and others? All that is taught *now,* was taught by these philosophers *then.* For they maintained—even in the fragments of their works still extant—that the Universe is composed of eternal atoms which, moved by a subtle internal Fire, combine in millions of various ways. With them, this "Fire" was the divine Breath of the Universal Mind, but now, it has become with the modern philosophers no better than a blind and senseless Force. Furthermore they taught that there was neither Life nor Death, but only a constant *destruction of form,* produced by perpetual *physical* transformations. This has now become by *intellectual* transformation, that which is known as the physical correlation of forces, conservation of energy, law of continuity, and what not, in the vocabulary of modern Science. But "what's in a name," or in new-fangled words and compound terms, once that the identity of the essential ideas is established?

Was not Descartes indebted for his *original* theories to the old Masters, to Leucippus and Democritus, Lucretius, Anaxagoras and Epicurus? These taught that the celestial bodies were formed of a multitude of atoms, whose vortical motion existed from eternity; which met, and, rotating together, the heaviest were drawn to the centres, the lightest to the circumferences; each of these concretions was carried away in a fluidic matter, which, receiving from this rotation an impulse, the stronger communicated it to the weaker concretions. This seems a tolerably close description of the Cartesian theory of Elemental Vortices taken from Anaxagoras and some others; and it does look most suspiciously like the "vortical atoms" of Sir W. Thomson!

Even Sir Isaac Newton, the greatest among the great, is found constantly mirroring a dozen or so of old philosophers. In reading his works one sees floating in the air the pale images of the same Anaxagoras and Democritus, of Pythagoras, Aristotle, Timæus of Locris, Lucretius, Macrobius, and even our old friend Plutarch. All these have maintained one or the other of these propositions, (1) that the smallest of the particles of matter would be sufficient—owing to its infinite divisibility—to fill infinite space; (2) that there exist two Forces emanated from the Universal Soul, combined in numerical proportions (the centripetal and centrifugal "forces", of the latter day scientific saints); (3) that there was a mutual attraction of bodies, which *attraction* causes the latter to, what we now call, *gravitate* and keeps them within their respective spheres; (4) they hinted most unmistakably at the relation existing between the weight and the density, or the quantity of matter contained in a unit of mass; and (5) taught that the attraction (gravitation) of

the planets toward the Sun is in reciprocal proportion to their distance from that luminary.

Finally, is it not a historical fact that the rotation of the Earth and the heliocentric system were taught by Pythagoras—not to speak of Hicetas, Heraclides, Ecphantus, &c.,—over 2,000 years before the despairing and now famous cry of Galileo, *"E pur, se muove"?* Did not the priests of Etruria and the Indian *Rishis* still earlier, know how to attract lightning, ages upon ages before even the *astral* Sir B. Franklin was formed in space? Euclid is honoured to this day—perhaps, because one cannot juggle as easily with mathematics and figures, as with symbols and words bearing on unprovable hypotheses. Archimedes had probably forgotten more in his day, than our modern mathematicians, astronomers, geometricians, mechanicians, hydrostatisticians and opticians ever knew. Without Archytas, the disciple of Pythagoras, the application of the theory of mathematics to practical purposes would, perchance, remain still unknown to our grand era of inventions and machinery. Needless to remind the reader of that which the Aryans knew, as it is already recorded in the *Theosophist* and other works obtainable in India.

Wise was Solomon in saying that "there is *no new* thing under the Sun"; and that everything that *is* "hath been already of old time, which was before us"—save, perhaps, the theosophical doctrines which the humble writer of the present is charged by some with having "invented". The prime origin of this (very complimentary) accusation is due to the kind efforts of the S. P. R. It is the more considerate and kind of this "world famous, and learned Society" of "Researches", as its scribes seem utterly incapable of inventing anything original themselves—even in the way of manufacturing a commonplace illustration. * * * * *
* * * * * * * * * * * * *

In short, it may be said of the scientific theories, that those which are true are not new; and those which are new—are not true, or are at least, very dubious. It is easy to hide behind "merely *working* hypotheses", but less easy to maintain their plausibility in the face of logic and philosophy. To make short work of a very big subject, we have but to institute a brief comparison between the old and the new teachings. That which modern science would make us believe, is this: the atoms possess *innate* and immutable properties. That which Esoteric, and also exoteric, Eastern philosophy calls *divine* Spirit Substance *(Purusha Prakriti)* or eternal Spirit-matter, one inseparable from the other, modern Science calls Force and Matter, adding as we do (for it is a Vedantic conception), that, the two being inseparable, matter is but an abstraction (an illusion rather). The properties of matter are, by the Eastern Occultists, summed up in, or brought down to, attraction and repulsion; by the Scientists, to gravitation and affinities. According to this teaching, the properties of complex combinations are but the necessary results of the composition of elementary properties; the

most complex existences being the physico-chemical automata, called men. Matter from being primarily scattered and inanimate, begets life, sensation, emotions and will, after a whole series of consecutive "gropings". The latter non-felicitous expression (belonging to Mr. Tyndal), forced the philosophical writer, Delboeuf* to criticize the English Scientist in very disrespectful terms, and forces us in our turn, to agree with the former. Matter, or anything equally conditioned, once that it is declared to be subject to immutable laws, *cannot* "grope". But this is a trifle when compared with dead or *inanimate* matter, producing *life,* and even psychic phenomena of the highest mentality! Finally, a rigid determinism reigns over all nature. All that which has once happened to our *automatical* Universe, had to happen, as the future of that Universe is traced in the smallest of its particles or "atoms". Return these atoms, they say, to the same position and order they were in at the first moment of the evolution of the physical Kosmos, and the same universal phenomena will be repeated in precisely the same order, and the Universe will once more return to its present conditions. To this, logic and philosophy answer that it cannot be so, as the properties of the particles vary and are changeable. If the atoms are eternal and matter indestructible, these atoms can never have been born; hence, they can have nothing *innate* in them. Theirs is the one homogeneous (and we add *divine*) substance, while compound molecules receive their properties, at the beginning of the life cycles or *manvantaras,* from *within without.* Organisms cannot have been developed from dead or *inanimate* matter, as, firstly, such matter does not exist, and secondly, philosophy proving it conclusively, the Universe is not "subjected to fatality". As Occult Science teaches that the universal process of differentiation begins anew after every period of *Maha-pralaya,* there is no reason to think that it would slavishly and blindly repeat itself. *Immutable* laws last only from the incipient to the last stage of the universal life, being simply the effects of primordial, intelligent and entirely free action. For Theosophists, as also for Dr. Pirogoff, Delboeuf and many a great independent modern thinker, it is the Universal (and to us *impersonal* because *infinite*) Mind, which is the true and primordial Demiurg.

What better illustrates the theory of cycles, than the following fact? Nearly 700 years B. C., in the schools of Thales and Pythagoras, was taught the doctrine of the true motion of the earth, its form and the whole heliocentric system. And in 317 A. D. Lactantius, the preceptor of Crispus Cæsar, the son of the Emperor Constantine, is found teaching his pupil that the earth was a plane surrounded by the sky, itself composed of fire and water! Moreover, the venerable Church Father warned his pupil against the *heretical doctrine of the earth's globular form,* as the Cambridge and Oxford "Father Dons" warn their students now, against the pernicious and superstitious doctrines of Theosophy—such as Universal Mind, Re-

*In the *Revue Philosophique* of 1883, where he translates such "gropings" by *atonnements successifs.*

incarnation and so on. There is a resolution tacitly accepted by the members of the T. S. for the adoption of a proverb of King Solomon, paraphrased for our daily use: "A scientist is wiser in his own conceit than seven Theosophists that can render a reason". No time, therefore, should be lost in arguing with them; but no endeavour, on the other hand, should be neglected to show up their mistakes and blunders. The scientific conceit of the Orientalists—especially of the youngest branch of these—the Assyriologists and the Egyptologists—is indeed phenomenal. Hitherto, some credit was given to the ancients—to their philosophers and *Initiates,* at any rate—of knowing a few things that the moderns could not rediscover. But now even the greatest Initiates are represented to the public as fools. Here is an instance. On pages 15, 16 and 17 *(Introduction)* in the Hibbert Lectures of 1887 by Prof. Sayce, on *The Ancient Babylonians,* the reader is brought face to face with a conundrum that may well stagger the unsophisticated admirer of modern learning. Complaining of the difficulties and obstacles that meet the Assyriologist at every step of his studies; after giving "the dreary catalogue" of the formidable struggles of the interpreter to make sense of the inscriptions from broken fragments of clay tiles; the Professor goes on to confess that the scholar who has to read these cuneiform characters, is often likely "to put a false construction upon isolated passages, the context of which must be supplied from conjecture" (p. 14). Notwithstanding all this, the learned lecturer *places the modern Assyriologist higher than the ancient Babylonian Initiate,* in the knowledge of symbols and his own religion!

The passage deserves to be quoted *in toto:*

> "It is true that many of the sacred texts were so written as to be intelligible only to the initiated; but the initiated were provided with keys and glosses, *many of which are in our hands* (?) . . . We can penetrate into the real meaning of documents which to him (the ordinary Babylonian) were a sealed book. Nay, more than this, the researches that have been made during the last half-century into the creed and beliefs of the nations of the world both past and present, *have given us a clue* to the interpretation of these documents *which even the initiated priests did not possess.*"

The above (the italics being our own) may be better appreciated when thrown into a syllogistic form.

Major premise: The ancient Initiates had keys and glosses to their esoteric texts, *of which they were the* INVENTORS.

Minor premise: Our Orientalists have *many* of these keys.

Conclusion; Ergo, the Orientalists have a clue which the *Initiates themselves did not possess!!*

Into what were the Initiates, in such a case, initiated?—and who invented the blinds, we ask.

Few Orientalists could answer this query. We are more generous, however; and may show in our next that, into which our modest Orientalists have never yet been initiated—all their alleged "clues" to the contrary.

(To be continued.) 444

ABOUT GREAT TEACHERS*

When great teachers like St. Paul, St. John, Socrates and others incarnate do they commence with the degree of development with which they closed the preceding incarnation? If so, why are there so few great souls in the world teaching and living the proper life?

William Q. Judge.—Let us take the last part of your question first, and ask you how do you know there are "so few great souls in the world"? It would not be right to judge all other men by yourself nor by a limited number of persons you may have known, hence it is likely you do not so judge, but have merely assumed that there are very few souls in the world like unto those you mention. Such an assumption does not seem to be a correct one. There very probably are among us now many great souls of the past. Nothing in philosophy or the doctrine of reïncarnation is against such a view. We being actors on the present stage are not able to judge whether some others of whom we know are great men or not, who may be regarded by posterity as great personages like to St. Paul and your other examples. It is more than likely St. Paul was not highly regarded in his time; now, in the distance, he shines out. Certainly we know that Socrates had such poor regard from his contemporaries as to be poisoned because he was thought not to be a good man: now we, so far off, look at him differently. In the same way will it be respecting our own present times after the lapse of centuries.

As to where any Ego will begin in any life is determined by karma and the needs of development. The whole front, or mass, of our nature is so enormous that one life or one sort of development is only a small part of it: there is no possibility of at once exhibiting it all. So the former life of St. Paul may be now certainly hidden for future use while he is undergoing another necessary development which had formerly been neglected. If we look at his life we find he was a persecutor once. That was not at all atoned for by his subsequent conduct—unless of course you admit vicarious salvation—which I do not. He must atone for all that hurt done to others, and his reïncarnation in some obscure place and body for several lives would quite accord with the needs of the case. So you can reason out the whole matter, recollecting that karma goes by cause and effect, and that the whole vast nature of man must be considered, and that you and I do not know the whole nature of those people you refer to. Hence we must conclude that the present age and the karma of past sages do not coïncide in such a way as to produce many living before us. And if we ask what is the use, we must conclude that in such a selfish, superficial time as this they would be useless and out of place.

---

* This answer by Mr. Judge to the question asked was first printed in *The Theosophical Forum* of Jan., 1896. The title used is our own [Ed. Theosophy.]

LEO TOLSTOI AND HIS UNECCLESIASTICAL CHRISTIANITY*[1]

TOLSTOI is a great poet, a great artist, a great thinker. All through his life, both heart and mind have been occupied by one burning question, coloring more or less with its painful pressure all his works. We feel its overshadowing presence in the "History of my Childhood", in "War and Peace", in "Anna Karenina", till at last it becomes the exclusive pre-occupation of his later years, which have produced such works as "My Confession", "In what does my Faith Consist?", "What shall we Do?", "Upon life", and the "Kreutzer Sonata". This same question burns in the hearts of many, especially among Theosophists; it is indeed *the* question of life itself. "What is the meaning, the purpose of human life? What is the final outcome of the unnatural, distorted and falsified life of our civilisation, such as it is forced upon each of us individually? What shall we do to be happy, *permanently* happy? How shall man escape the horror of inevitable death?" To these ever recurring questions, Tolstoi, in his earlier works, gives no answer because he had found none himself. But he could not rest contented, as do millions of others, weaker or more cowardly natures, without an answer, one at least satisfying to his own heart and intellect; and in the five last-named works is contained that answer. An answer, it is true, that will not content the Theosophist *in the form in which Tolstoi gives it,* but an answer in whose basic, vital thought he may find new light, fresh hope, stronger comfort. But to understand it, we must briefly trace the road by which Tolstoi reached the peace he has found; for unless we can *feel,* as well as understand the inner process which led him thither, his solution, like every other solution of life's problem, must remain a dead letter, a merely intellectual word-conception, lacking all vital force and motive power; a mere speculation, not a living truth instinct with enthusiasm.

Like all thinking men and women of to-day, Tolstoi lost faith in religion early in life; for this loss of one's childish faith—inevitable in every life—is not, as a rule, the result of deep thought; it is rather the natural consequence of our culture and of our general experience of life. As he says himself, his faith vanished, he knew not how. But his youthful striving after ethical perfection survived for some ten years, to die out by degrees, finally disappearing utterly. Seeing everywhere around him ambition, love of power, selfishness and sensuality triumphant; seeing all that is called virtue, goodness, purity, altruism, scorned and flouted, failing to give either inward happiness and content or outward success; Tolstoi went the

---

* This article was first printed by H. P. Blavatsky in *Lucifer* for September, 1890.

[1] An essay by Raphael von Koeber, Dr. Phiel.; with an appendix by Dr. Hübbe Schleiden, Dr. jur; uto.

way of the world, did as he saw others do, practising all the vices and meannesses of the "polite world". Then he turned to literature, became a great poet, a most successful author, seeking ever, he tells us, to hide his own ignorance from himself by teaching others. For some years he succeeded in thus stifling his inner discontent, but ever more frequently, more poignantly, the question forced itself upon him: What am I living for? What do I know? And daily he saw more clearly that he had no answer to give. He was fifty years old when his despair reached its height. At the summit of his fame, a happy husband and father, author of many splendid poems full of the deepest knowledge of men and of the wisdom of life, Tolstoi realized the utter impossibility of going on living. "Man cannot imagine life, without the desire for well-being. To *desire* and attain that well-being—is to *live*. Man probes life only that he may improve it." Our science, on the contrary, investigates only the *shadows* of things, not their realities; and under the delusion that this unimportant secondary is the essential, science distorts the idea of life and forgets her true destiny, which is to fathom *this* very secret, *not* what to-day is discovered and to-morrow is forgotten.

Philosophy tells us: "You are a part of Humanity, therefore you must co-operate in the development of Humanity and in the realising of its ideals; your life's goal coincides with that of all other men". But how does it help me to know that I live for that for which all Humanity lives, when I am *not* told *what it is for which that very Humanity does live?* Why does the world exist? What is the outcome of the fact that it does exist and will exist? Philosophy gives *no* answer.

Scepticism, Nihilism, Despair—thither the thinking man is driven by such thoughts, if he seeks the last word of Wisdom in the Science and Philosophy of the schools. Such, too, is the *real*, inner, mental condition of many an one, both without and within the Theosophical Society.

In regard to this, the problem of life, Tolstoi divides men in general into four classes:—

"Some, young and feeble of intellect, live happily in their ignorance—for them the problem of life has, as yet, no existence.

"Others know and understand the problem well enough, but turn purposely away from it, favored by fortunate surroundings which permit them to pass their lives as it were in intoxication.

"The third group consists of those who know that death is better than a life passed in error and ignorance; but they live on, because they lack the strength to put a sudden end to the fraud—life.

"Finally, there are the strong and consistent natures, who grasp the whole stupidity of the farce being played with them, therefore put an end to this silly farce at one stroke."

"I could do nothing," he says, "but think, think of the horrible position I was in. . . . My inner condition at that time, which brought me near to suicide, was such that everything I had hitherto done, everything I could still do, seemed to me foolish and bad. Even what was most precious to me

in life, what had so far drawn away my eyes from the cruel reality—my family and my art—even these lost all value for me."

From this depth of despair he escaped at length. "Life is all," he reasoned, "I, my reason itself, are products of this general life. But at the same time Reason is the creator and the final judge of human life *proper*. How then can reason deny to the latter a meaning without denying itself and calling itself senseless? Hence I am only calling life meaningless, because *I* do not grasp its meaning." Convinced that Life *has* a meaning, Tolstoi sought this meaning among those who *really live*—the people. But there he again met disappointment, the bitterest of all, because here lay his last hope. For, among the people, he found only a solution of life's problem resting upon a conception of the universe which is *contrary to reason,* and is based upon that blind faith he had long since cast aside.

"I subjected," he tells us, "the *dicta* of my reason to a fresh examination, and found that Reason did not suffice to answer my questions, because it does not bring into its reasoning the conception of the Infinite (Cause-less, Time-less, Space-less); because it explains my life, passed in Time, Space, and Causality, in terms of Time, Space, and Causality again: thus explaining it indeed with logical correctness, but only in terms of the same components, *i. e.*, leaving its ultimate basis—with which alone we are concerned—unexplained. Religion, on the contrary, does the exact opposite: she knows no logic, but does know the conception of the Infinite, to which she refers everything, and, to that extent, gives correct answers. Religion says: Thou shall live according to the law of God; the outcome of thy life will be eternal suffering or eternal happiness; the meaning of thy life, which is not annihilated by death, is union with the Infinite Deity. . . . The conception of the Infinite Deity, of the divinity of the Soul, of the relations of human actions to God: these are conceptions, which have been ripened in the hidden infinity of human thought, and without which there would be no life, and I too should not exist."

"But what is God? On what train of thought rests the belief in his existence and in the relation of man to him? If I am," reasoned Tolstoi, "there must be a reason for my being, and a reason for that ground, and an ultimate reason, and this is God. I felt calmed; my uncertainty and the consciousness of standing orphaned in life vanished. But when I asked myself: What is God? How shall I act towards him? I found only *banal* answers that destroyed my faith again. . . . But that I have the conception of God in me, the *fact* and the *necessity* of this conception—of this no one can deprive me. Whence then this conception? Whence its necessity? This necessity is God himself. And I felt glad again. All things around me lived, and had a meaning. The conception of God is not indeed God himself; but the *necessity* of forming this conception, the craving for a knowledge of God, through which knowledge I live—*that* is God, the living and life-giving God. . . . Live in the thought, thou art a manifestation of God, and then thy life will testify to the existence of God."

Tolstoi had regained Faith, "the evidence of things not seen," and his religious faith expressed itself for three years in a life in strict conformity with the most stringent prescriptions of the orthodox Greek Church. But at last, finding the Church and the entire Christian community acting in direct contradiction to his root-conception of true Religion, he broke loose from orthodoxy and set

out to determine what is True in Religion for himself from the study of the New Testament.

But before considering the conclusions he reached, let us examine for a moment, from the Theosophical standpoint, Tolstoi's fundamental position. His argument for the existence of an Infinite God as the necessary "ultimate ground" of human reason, is precisely one of the Theosophist's arguments for the existence of Kosmic or Universal Mind, and, as an argument, it proves nothing more. Influenced by Western habits of feeling, he ascribes to the Universal Mind anthropomorphic attributes which it cannot possess, thus sowing the seeds of the strained and forced conclusions as to practical action which he subsequently arrives at. Fundamentally he is right; but in the effort to satisfy the demands of his emotional nature he falls into a quasi-anthropomorphism. For us, however, more importance attaches to the poignant picture he presents of the mental misery that tortures every honest thinker to-day, and to his pointing out of the road, the only road, by which an escape is possible. For starting from his basis we are led, if we reason carefully and closely, to the basic conclusions of Theosophical teaching, as will be seen later.

To return to Tolstoi's religious unfoldment. Studying the Gospels, he came to find the kernel, the essence of Jesus' teaching in the Sermon on the Mount, understood in its literal, simple sense, "even as a little child would understand it". He considers as the perfect expression of Christ's law of Charity and Peace, the command, "Resist not evil", which to him is the most perfect rendering of *true* Christianity, and this command he describes as "the sole and eternal law of God and of men". He also points out that long before the appearance of the historical Jesus, this law was known and recognised by all the leaders and benefactors of the human race. "The progress of mankind towards good", he writes, "is brought about by those who suffer, *not* by those who inflict, martyrdom."

Such is the essence of Tolstoi's religion; but we shall be better able to enter into its real meaning and appreciate his practical deductions therefrom, after having examined, first, his doctrine of religious bliss, and second, his philosophy of life.

I believe, says Tolstoi: (1) that happiness on earth depends solely upon the fulfilling of Christ's teaching; (2) that its fulfilment is not only possible, but easy and full of joy. Happiness, he teaches, is love towards all men, union with them, and evil is the breach of this unity. Love and unity are the natural condition of men, in which all men find themselves who are not led astray by false teachings.

These conceptions changed his whole view of life; all he had before striven for, all that counts for so much in the world, honor, fame, culture, riches, increased refinement of life, of surroundings,

of food, of clothing, of manners—all this lost its value in his eyes, and in place of them he came to esteem what the *World* calls bad and low, simplicity, poverty, want of culture. But the real essence of his teaching lies in the conception of the Universal Brotherhood of mankind.

For Tolstoi, *Life* means the striving of man after well being, after happiness, a happiness only to be attained, as we have seen, through the fulfilment of the commands of Jesus. Of these commands the deepest meaning is: true life, therefore also true happiness, consists—not in the preservation of one's personality, but—in absorption into the All, into God and Humanity. Since God is Reason, the Christian teaching may be formulated thus: subordinate thy personal life to reason, which demands of thee unconditional love for all beings.*

The personal life, that which recognises and wills only one's own "I", is the animal life; the life of reason is the human, the existence proper to man according to his nature as man. The crowning maxim of Stoic ethics: live according to nature, according to thy *human* nature, expresses the same thing. The teachings of the wisest law-givers: the Brahmans, Guatama Buddha, Confucius, Lao-Tze, Moses, all contain the same explanation of life, make the same demand upon the man. For, from the remotest times onwards, Humanity has ever been conscious of the torturing inner contradiction, wherein all who seek after personal well-being find themselves. As, unfortunately, there is no other solution of this contradiction except to transfer the centre of attraction of one's existence[1] *from* the personality, which can never be saved from destruction, *to* the everlasting All, it is intelligible that all the sages of the past, and with them also the greatest thinkers of later centuries, have established doctrines and moral laws identical in their general meaning because they saw more clearly than other men both this contradiction and its solution.

It is not difficult to see wherein consists the basic contradiction of personal life. That which for man is the most important, that alone which he desires, that which—as it seems to him—alone really *lives*, namely his personality, is destroyed, becomes a skeleton, decays, does *not* remain "himself"; while that which he does *not* desire, which has no value for him, the life and welfare of which he does *not* feel, the whole outside world of struggling beings, that proves itself to be that which endures, which truly lives.

With the awakening of the reasoning consciousness, which must occur sooner or later in every man, he becomes conscious of the gulf between the animal and the human life; he realises this more and more fully, till at last—on the highest plane of consciousness—the fundamental contradiction of life is recognised as only an *apparent* contradiction, pertaining solely to the sphere of animal

---

* Absolutely the same doctrine as that taught by Buddha and all other Initiates, Plato included. A fact recognised by Tolstoi, though not given its due significance by him.

[1] Where thy treasure is, there will thy heart be also.

existence, and the meaning of life, after which the personal man seeks in vain, is at last discovered. It is not discovered by logical deduction, but intuitively. The spiritually awakened or regenerated man suddenly finds himself transported into the eternal, timeless condition of the life of pure "Reason",* in which can be no more illusions, contradictions, riddles. . . . . The life of reason is, as the original and only true life, also the *normal* life of man: and man as such can only be called "living" in so far as he subdues the animal in him under the law of Reason; precisely as the animal only *really lives* when it obeys, not only the laws of the matter which composes it, but also the higher law of organic life. . . . . When once it has been recognised that, in specifically human life, the primacy naturally belongs not to the personality, but to the Reason, there is nothing superhuman in following the *natural* law of human life and both regarding and using as a *tool* what *is* a mere tool of the true life—the personality. . . . . But it may be asked: Why then do we have a personality if we are to renounce it, deny it? In order that the personality, like any tool, may serve *merely* as a means to an end—other answer there is none. The personality is nothing but the "spade", that is given to the reasoning being to be dug with, to be blunted in that digging and then sharpened again, to be used up, but not to be cleaned and stored away. To *use* a tool as a tool is not to *deny* it, but simply to make it serve its proper purpose, *i. e.*, Reason.

This is Tolstoi's philosophy of life, identical in its basis with that of Theosophy. But lacking the universality of the latter, leaning too exclusively upon the corrupted and fragmentary dicta of but one Teacher of Wisdom, Tolstoi's philosophy fails to guide him in practice and, as a study of his work shows, lands him eventually in self-contradiction. This self-contradiction, however, being but of the surface, of the physical plane only, is of relatively small importance, contrasted with the real escape he has made beyond the delusions in which most of us live.

Want of space renders it impossible to follow out into further detail the comparison between Tolstoi's views and those of Theosophy. Every reader of *Lucifer* can readily do so for himself, and we will only add that Dr. Von Koeber's essay, which has supplied the material for the above sketch, and of which it is mainly a summary, is worthy the careful study of every one who can read German. Of the Appendix, which Dr. Hübbe Schleiden has tacked on thereto, it must be said to show a want of appreciation and understanding of the true spirit and meaning of Tolstoi's thought and action, which seems to indicate the same misconception of the nature of *real* "mysticism", that may be noticed in the same writer's other essays.

---

* Meaning Plato's "Noetic Life."

AN IMPORTANT LETTER

This letter, from a Master of Wisdom, was first printed *complete* in *Lucifer* for August, 1896. It is said to have been received by H. P. Blavatsky some ten years before; and quotations from it had been printed elsewhere before its appearance in *Lucifer,* as below. [Ed. Theosophy.]

THE doctrine we promulgate being the only true one, must—supported by such evidence as we are preparing to give—become ultimately triumphant, like every other truth. Yet it is absolutely necessary to inculcate it gradually; enforcing its theories (unimpeachable facts for those who know) with direct inference, deduced from and corroborated by, the evidence furnished by modern exact science. That is why Col. H. S. Olcott, who works to revive Buddhism, may be regarded as one who labours in the true path of Theosophy, far more than any man who chooses as his goal the gratification of his own ardent aspirations for occult knowledge. Buddhism, stripped of its superstition, is eternal truth; and he who strives for the latter is striving for Theo-Sophia, divine wisdom, which is a synonym of truth. For our doctrines to practically react on the so-called moral code, or the ideas of truthfulness, purity, self-denial, charity, etc., we have to preach and popularize a knowledge of Theosophy. It is not the individual and determined purpose of attaining Nirvâna—the culmination of all knowledge and absolute wisdom, which is after all only an exalted and glorious selfishness—but the self-sacrificing pursuit of the best means to lead on the right path our neighbour, to cause to benefit by it as many of our fellow creatures as we possibly can, which constitutes the true Theosophist.

The intellectual portion of mankind seems to be fast dividing into two classes: the one unconsciously preparing for itself long periods of temporary annihilation or states of non-consciousness, owing to the deliberate surrender of intellect and its imprisonment in the narrow grooves of bigotry and superstition—a process which cannot fail to lead to the utter deformation of the intellectual principle; the other unrestrainedly indulging its animal propensities with the deliberate intention of submitting to annihilation pure and simple, in case of failure, and to millenniums of degradation after physical dissolution. Those intellectual classes reacting upon the ignorant masses—which they attract, and which look up to them as noble and fit examples to be followed—degrade and morally ruin those they ought to protect and guide. Between degrading superstition and still more degrading brutal materialism, the White Dove of Truth has hardly room whereon to rest her weary unwelcome feet.

It is time that Theosophy should enter the arena. The sons of Theosophists are more likely to become in their turn Theosophists than anything else. No messenger of the truth, no prophet has ever achieved during his life-time a complete triumph—not even

Buddha. The Theosophical Society was chosen as the cornerstone, the foundation of the future religions of humanity. To achieve the proposed object, a greater, wiser, and especially a more benevolent intermingling of the high and the low, the alpha and the omega of society, was determined upon. The white race must be the first to stretch out the hand of fellowship to the dark nations, to call the poor despised "nigger" brother. This prospect may not smile for all, but he is no Theosophist who objects to this principle. In view of the ever-increasing triumph, and at the same time misuse, of free thought and liberty (the universal reign of Satan, Eliphas Lévi would have called it) how is the combative natural instinct of man to be restrained from inflicting hitherto unheard-of cruelty and enormous tyranny, injustice, etc., if not through the soothing influence of brotherhood, and of the practical application of Buddha's esoteric doctrines? For everyone knows that total emancipation from the authority of the one all-pervading power, or law—called God by the priests, Buddha, divine wisdom and enlightenment, or Theosophy, by the philosophers of all ages—means also the emancipation from that of human law. Once unfettered, delivered from their dead-weight of dogmatism, interpretations, personal names, anthropomorphic conceptions, and salaried priests, the fundamental doctrines of all religions will be proved identical in their esoteric meaning. Osiris, Krishna, Buddha, Christ, will be shown as different means for one and the same royal highway of final bliss—Nirvâna. Mystical Christianity teaches *Self*-redemption through one's own seventh principle, the liberated Paramâtmâ, called by the one Christ, by others Buddha; this is equivalent to regeneration, or rebirth in spirit, and it therefore expounds just the same truth as the Nirvâna of Buddhism. All of us have to get rid of our own Ego, the illusory, apparent self, to recognize our true Self, in a transcendental divine life. But if we would not be selfish we must strive to make other people see that truth, and recognize the reality of the transcendental Self, the Buddha, the Christ, or God of every preacher. This is why even esoteric Buddhism is the surest path to lead men toward the one esoteric truth.

As we find the world now, whether Christian, Mussulman, or Pagan, justice is disregarded, and honour and mercy are both flung to the winds. In a word, how—since the main objects of the Theosophical Society are misinterpreted by those who are most willing to serve us personally—are we to deal with the rest of mankind? with that curse known as *the struggle for life*, which is the real and most prolific parent of most woes and sorrows, and all crimes? Why has that struggle become almost the universal scheme of the universe? We answer, because no religion, with the exception of Buddhism, has taught a practical contempt for this earthly life; while each of them, always with that solitary exception, has through its hells and damnations inculcated the greatest dread of death. Therefore do we find that struggle for life raging most fiercely in Christian countries, most prevalent in Europe and America. It

weakens in the Pagan lands, and is nearly unknown among Buddhist populations. In China during famine, and where the masses are most ignorant of their own or of any religion, it was remarked that those mothers who devoured their children belonged to localities where there was none; and that where the Bonzes alone had the field, the population died with the utmost indifference. Teach the people to see that life on this earth, even the happiest, is but a burden and an illusion; that it is our own Karma [the cause producing the effects] that is our own judge—our Saviour in future lives—and the great struggle for life will soon lose its intensity. There are no penitentiaries in Buddhist lands, and crime is nearly unknown among the Buddhist Tibetans. The world in general, and Christendom especially, left for 2,000 years to the *régime* of a personal God, as well as to its political and social systems based on that idea, has now proved a failure.

If the Theosophists say we have nothing to do with all this; the lower classes and inferior races (those of India, for instance, in the conception of the British) cannot concern us, and must manage as they can, what becomes of our fine professions of benevolence, philanthropy, reform, etc.? Are those professions a mockery? And if a mockery, can ours be the true path? Shall we devote ourselves to teaching a few Europeans—fed on the fat of the land, many of them loaded with the gifts of blind fortune—the rationale of bell-ringing, of cup-growing, of the spiritual telephone, and astral body formation, and leave the teeming millions of the ignorant, of the poor and oppressed, to take care of themselves, and of their hereafter, as best they can? Never! perish rather the Theosophical Society with both its hapless Founders, than that we should permit it to become no better than an academy of magic, and a hall of occultism! That we, the devoted followers of that spirit incarnate of absolute self-sacrifice, of philanthropy, divine kindness, as of all the highest virtues attainable on this earth of sorrow, the man of men, Gautama Buddha, should ever allow the Theosophical Society to represent the embodiment of selfishness, the refuge of the few, with no thought in them for the many, is a strange idea, my brothers! Among the few glimpses obtained by Europeans of Tibet and its mystical hierarchy of perfect Lamas there was one which was correctly understood and described. The incarnations of the Bodhisattva Padmapâni or Avalokiteshvara, of Tsongkapa, and that of Amitâbha, relinquished at their death the attainment of Buddhahood, *i. e.*, the *summum bonum* of bliss, and of individual personal felicity, that they might be born again and again for the benefit of mankind. In other words, that they might be again and again subjected to misery, imprisonment in flesh, and all the sorrows of life provided that they, by such a self-sacrifice, repeated throughout long and weary centuries, might become the means of securing salvation and bliss in the hereafter for a handful of men chosen among but one of the many planetary races of mankind. And it is we, the humble disciples of these perfect Lamas

who are expected to allow the Theosophical Society to drop its noblest title, that of the Brotherhood of Humanity, to become a simple school of philosophy! No, no, good brothers, you have been labouring under the mistake too long already. Let us understand each other. He who does not feel competent to grasp the noble idea sufficiently to work for it, need not undertake a task too heavy for him. But there is hardly a Theosophist in the whole Society unable to effectually help it by correcting erroneous impressions of outsiders, by himself actually propagating this idea. Oh! for noble and unselfish men to help us effectually in that divine task! All our knowledge, past and present, would not be sufficient to repay them.

Having explained our views and aspirations, I have but a few words more to add. The true religion and philosophy offer the solution of every problem. That the world is in such a bad condition, morally, is a conclusive evidence that none of its religions and philosophies, those of the civilized races less than any other, has ever possessed the truth. The right and logical explanations on the subject of the problems of the great dual principles, right and wrong, good and evil, liberty and despotism, pain and pleasure, egotism and altruism, are as impossible to them now as they were 1886 years ago. They are as far from the solution as they were; but to these problems there must be somewhere a consistent solution, and if our doctrines will show their competence to offer it, then the world will be the first to confess that *there* must be the true philosophy, the true religion, the true light, which gives truth and nothing but the truth.

FROM THE NOTE BOOK OF AN UNPOPULAR PHILOSOPHER*

THE ESOTERIC VALUE OF CERTAIN WORDS AND DEEDS IN SOCIAL LIFE.

A DEFINITION of *Public Opinion*. The gathering of a few fogies positively electrified by fanaticism and force of habit, who act on the many noodles negatively electrified by indifference. The acceptation of uncharitable views on "suggestion" by "telepathic impact" (what ever that may mean). The work of unconscious psychology.

Sympathetic grief.—The expression thereof in Society, for one's sorrow, is like a solemn funeral procession, in which the row of mourning coaches is long, indeed, but the carriages of which are all empty.

Mutual exchange of compliments.—Expressions of delight and other acting in cultured society are the fig-leaves of the civilised

* This article was first printed by H. P. Blavatsky in *Lucifer* for September, 1887.

Adams and Eves. These "aprons" to conceal truth are fabricated incessantly in social Edens, and their name is—*politeness*.

Keeping the Sabbath.—Throwing public contumely on, and parading one's superiority over Christ, "one greater than the temple" and Sabbath, who stood for his disciples' rights to "break" the Sabbath, for the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for Sabbath (Matt. xii. and Mark ii., etc.).

Attending Divine Service.—Breaking the express commandment of Jesus. Becoming "as the hypocrites are," who love to pray in Synagogue and Temples, "that they may be seen of men." (Matt. vi.).

Taking the Oath, on the Bible.—A Christian law, devised and adopted to perpetuate and carry out the unequivocal commandment of the Founder of Christianity, "Swear not at all, neither by heaven nor by the earth" (Matt. v.). As the heaven and the earth are supposed to have been created *only* by God, a book written by *men* thus received the prerogative over the former.

Unpopularity.—We hate but those whom we envy or fear. Hatred is a concealed and forced homage rendered to the person hated; a tacit admission of the superiority of the unpopular character.

The true value of *back-biting and slander.* A proof of the fast coming triumph of the victim chosen. The bite of the fly when the creature feels its end approaching.

A Few Illustrations to the Point from Schopenhauer.

Socrates was repeatedly vilified and thrashed by the opponents of his philosophy, and was as repeatedly urged by his friends to have his honour avenged in the tribunals of Athens. Kicked by a rude citizen, in the presence of his followers, one of these expressed surprise for his not resenting the insult, to which the Sage replied:

"Shall I then feel offended, and ask the magistrate to avenge me, if I also happen to be kicked by an ass?"

To another remark whether a certain man had abused and called him names, he quietly answered:

"No; for none of the epithets he used can possibly apply to me." (From Plato's "Georgics").

"The famous cynic, Cratus, having received from the musician Nicodromus a blow which caused his face to swell, coolly fixed a tablet upon his brow, inscribed with the two words, *"Nicodromus facit."* The flute player hardly escaped with his life from the hands of the populace, which viewed Cratus as a household god.

Seneca, in his work *"De Constanta Sapientis,"* treats most elaborately of insults in words and deeds, or *contumelia,* and then declares that no Sage ever pays the smallest attention to such things.
—"Well, yes!" the reader will exclaim, "but these men were all of them *Sages!"*
—"And you, are you then only *fools?* Agreed!"

"SEEKING THE HIGHER EGO"*

WE read continually in the Upanishads, the New Testament, Bhagavad Gîta, the Chinese Scriptures and elsewhere, that the light is to be sought and found within ourselves. (1) What do they all mean? (2) How is this light found? (3) How may it be supposed to manifest itself when found?

Of so profound a subject only a mere outline can be given. Let us take the first of these questions. Physical man bases all his activities upon sense-perception, and upon what is then, to him, the legitimate gratification of all sensation. Under these conditions he finds himself involved in the most deadly strife with all other creatures, all are bent upon attaining the same end, the desire does not decrease with attainment, but immediately seeks other and wider ground, and the field, practically, is limited. Thus the strife may become more subtle, but not less fierce. It is just at this point that reason comes in. What is reason? It is the activity on the lowest plane of the true Ego, the man within. It is the first guide of physical, animal man. At first, it holds but slight control, man acts often blindly, the creature of the sensations and impulses of the moment, making but little effort against the influence of these. Afterwards, as reason secures its sway, man begins to act with calculation and foresight; but all this has only made him a more deadly foe to the rest of living things. He organises and controls but to slay or betray; there is no difference to him between friend and foe, beyond what may serve his interests. Treachery is his great characteristic and he only keeps faith when it suits him. With the further growth of reason the "virtues" begin to appear: they are the result of enlightened self-interest; without them there can be no society or friendship.

At this stage also another factor appears: it is conscience. What is conscience? It is that mysterious faculty which silently points the road, always by what we know; it never instructs, it draws up and arranges our knowledge of "right" and of "wrong," limited as it is; and is always on the side of what then appears "right." Hence it is given to us as the highest faculty of the mind. It presides over reason; for all reasoning is merely data for it. It is all we know of the Higher Ego.

This then is the light to be sought, and we are brought to our second question;—How? The conditions of its activity are silence and seclusion, and also the highest ratiocination of which the mind is capable centred on the most exalted subjects upon which light is sought. Concentration and perseverance are necessary, and the constant habit of self-criticism, and courage to fulfil the judgments of this silent president. It will not pass higher judgments until

* This article was first printed by H. P. Blavatsky in *Lucifer* for January, 1891.

those already given are fulfilled. It never revokes, and it never forgets, although the mind through which it is reflected may. This concentration and abstraction cannot take place whilst there is great activity of the sense life; hence simplicity of life, and absence of pleasure. Seeking on the outer plane, and also indifference to pain, have always been pointed out as necessary. Then the mind gaining proficiency in this, and becoming more and more accustomed to lay bare quickly all it knows, for judgment to be declared, and evincing ever-growing willingness to obey and see, finds itself at length one with that monitor, it draws no distinction between them. As at sunset on a tranquil sea, the golden light above cannot be separated from that below; and when it vanishes, it takes all its glory with it.

And now for the third question:—How may it be supposed to manifest itself when found? The reply is obvious; the mind instantly, like a lightning flash, distinguishes between what, to it, is "right" and "wrong", "good" and "evil." The Light is flashed upon every proposition *instantly*. The man with small understanding becomes wise; the intellectual man becomes a giant of judgment. They both become unflinching and invincible, each according to his capacity. Moreover where the mind is greatly withdrawn from the pursuits of the world, and brought diligently to bear upon all those many subjects, with which it, as it were, paves for itself "the path of rectitude", throwing aside all those cobblestones which do not suit its purpose, although they may appear ornamental, even of gold itself, the progress to enlightenment is extremely rapid; for that upon which the mind is entirely bent is soon acquired.—"He necessarily becomes that on which his mind is fixed. This is the eternal mystery." *(Anugîta.)*

But for most men the letting go of the innumerable threads which bind to the changing and perishable, is so hard a task, that the fixing of the mind, so relieved, upon the permanent and immutable, progresses slowly indeed. "S."

ON THE LOOKOUT

The Law of Periodicity, or the return of impression, manifests "in every department of Nature," as our Theosophical speakers and writers have so many times phrased it. The Lookout is moved to another repetition of this trite—and true—statement by a report in the New York *Sun* concerning the general conference of Methodist ministers in Saratoga during the early part of the "merrie month of May." The headline reads, "'Ware Lady Nicotine All You Methodists"; and here is a portion of the report:

> SARATOGA, N. Y., May 6.—The prohibition against the use of tobacco by Methodist ministers was extended in a modified form to laymen by the general conference today, which adopted a resolution condemning the use of the cigarette "anywhere and at all times," and recommending to all members the practice of self-denial, if need be, in abstaining from the use of tobacco for the sake of the influence such a course would have upon young people.

Now the delightful application of the above to the Law of Cycles may be found in a squib in the old *Theosophist* (November, 1881) unsigned and printed quite innocently without a title. The Lookout discovered it some years ago while indulging in a somewhat protracted spell of browsing in the old magazines, and has been seeking a fitting excuse to print it ever since. Fancy the merry twinkle in H. P. B.'s eyes when she penned the following:

> BABY REVERENDS—At the Methodist conference last week, the White Tied Ones sitting in holy conclave were sorely exercised by the fact that some of the nice little baby-boy preachers smoked. This is awful when you come to think about it solemn-like. Just fancy the potent archangel Gabriel looking down into these youngsters' studies, and finding the incipient Reverend Tommy Klinker or the beardless Reverend Bill Blote furtively taking a cigar or a pull at a pipe of bird's-eye! It's terrific to think of the words which would come to, and fall from, the blessed archangelic lips. But I must pipe a lay to this subject.

Sad and solemn, sad and sorry,
  Sat the Methodistic crew;
Sad and solemn, sad and sorry,
  For they knew not what to do.
Vain they searched all through the Fathers,
  Seached the Saints, the Gospels too;
But those careless, careless writers
  Had not banned narcotic's dew.

"If St. Paul," they wept in chorus,
  "Had but said that pipes were damned,
If St. James the less had told us
  Smokers would in fire be rammed;
"If St. Peter had but slogged at
  Bird's-eye, Black Jack, shag, and snuff,
We could then have told these youngsters
  Baccy was the devil's stuff."
Still these gray-beards, croaking sadly,
  Felt the battle must be fought,
So they hinted that flayed badly
  Would be students smoking caught.

———

Students of the *Secret Doctrine* will be interested in the following extract from the magazine section of a recent California newspaper. Not only

is the subject-matter in itself of interest; but the slenderness of observation upon which scientific theories are often based, and the ease with which they are cast aside for other equally tenuous theories, are clearly shown. Why should not physiologists frankly admit that they really know nothing about the uses of the pineal gland—and have done with it? The extract reads this way:—

> From time to time during the last two years attention has been called to the therapeutic uses of extracts made from the pineal gland. This little gland, which is located in the brain, and in man is about the size of a pea, has been the object of study for several centuries. At one time it was thought to be the seat of the soul. Later it was suspected of representing the remains of an eye—a third member of vision which our prehistoric ancestors possessed, located conveniently in the back of the head. This idea was soon abandoned by the scientists, but still remains popular with fiction writers to whom this conception of a three-eyed man makes strong appeal.
>
> The last-but-one conception of this little gland is that it plays an important part in the development of the body, exerting a definite influence on the brain. Many apparently competent observers have reported that when extracts prepared from the pineal glands of the lower animals are given internally, the therapeutic action is to hasten the development of mentally backward children, and retard the encroachments of senility.
>
> This is the next to the latest theory. The very latest one is that it does nothing of the kind—that it is an entirely useless, although harmless, structure which seems to have escaped the discard in the hurry of creation. As proof of this, a learned professor in one of our great universities has removed the pineal glands of numerous puppies, and finds that the growth and development of the dogs are in no wise changed or retarded.
>
> One who is unfamiliar with the vagaries of scientific investigation would suppose that such a demonstration is conclusive evidence against the activity of this little organ. Not at all. Equally competent observers have witnessed precisely opposite effects. The defect in such conflicting evidence lies in the fact that all observers are influenced by personal prejudice, and therefore see things through their own particular brand of astigmatic lenses. As a result, precisely opposite opinions are formed, as in the case of this pineal gland controversy. Meanwhile pineal gland extract is being marketed and used extensively for stimulating the retarded mentality of backward children, apparently with gratifying results.

In the Second Volume of the *Secret Doctrine* H. P. Blavatsky has much to say of the pineal gland, identifying it as the well-nigh atrophied remnant of the Third Eye of ancient races; and it would seem from what she elsewhere writes that the revivifying of this organ is not so impossible as some may think. The implication seems clear that the pineal gland is psycho-spiritual in nature, a connection between the soul of man and his body, or brain. The fact that it is not active in most people nowadays, and that its use is generally forgotten, may be understood, perhaps, through a consideration of one statement, tremendous in its significance, from the *Secret Doctrine*:— "Now what students of Occultism ought to know is that the Third Eye *is indissolubly connected with Karma.* The tenet is so mysterious that very few have heard of it." H. P. B. also quotes the following from the Commentaries, a passage that every Theosophist would do well to ponder:—

> *There were four-armed human creatures in those early days of the male-females [hermaphrodites]; with one head, yet three eyes. They*

could see before them and behind them. A Kalpa later [after the separation of the sexes] men having fallen into matter, their spiritual vision became dim; and coördinately the Third Eye commenced to lose its power. . . . When the Fourth [Race] arrived at its middle age, the Inner Vision had to be awakened, and acquired by artificial stimuli, the process of which was known to the old Sages.*[1] *. . . The Third Eye, likewise, getting gradually petrified,*[2] *soon disappeared. The double-faced became the one-faced, and the eye was drawn deep into the head and is now buried under the hair. During the activity of the Inner Man [during trances and spiritual visions] the eye swells and expands. The Arhat sees and feels it, and regulates his action accordingly. . . . The undefiled Lanoo [Disciple, Chela] need fear no danger; he who keeps himself not in purity [who is not chaste] will receive no help from the "Deva Eye."*

And She adds these words:—"Unfortunately not. The 'Deva Eye' exists no more for the majority of mankind. The Third Eye *is dead,* and acts no longer; but it has left behind a witness to its existence. This witness is now the Pineal Gland."

This is indeed an age of transition, when every system of thought, science, religion, government, and society is changing. But who would expect the entering wedge of rationalism to affect Presbyterianism? Here are dogmas as solid as the granite New England hills, and just about as yielding. Here are churchmen whose duty it has been most particularly to accept, to believe, to adhere, to obey—the grimmest and perhaps most terrible of all the creeds of today called "Christian." Yet the signs of the times are expressing themselves even in the Presbyterian fold, though the broadening influence is being fought bitterly by the more orthodox element within that faith.

As one newspaper account puts it:—

> "The controversy between opponents of Union Seminary and the New York Presbytery of the Presbyterian Church has been made more acute this year by the action, a few weeks ago, of the New York Presbytery in licensing to preach three Union graduates who refused to affirm their belief in such important doctrines as the virgin birth of Christ and his bodily resurrection. The licensing of these men so stirred a certain section of the church that the Cincinnati Presbytery voted to ask the General Assembly of the church, meeting this week in Atlantic City, to cut off the New York Presbytery."

One of the principal opponents of the seminary, the Rev. John Fox, D.D., who is secretary of the American Bible Society, has written a lengthy exposition of the opposition's point of view, for the New York *Sun*. He takes the position that the Bible is literally the Word of God, though where he received this information and how he proves it, the gentleman does not state. Writes the Rev. Fox:—

> "Is the Bible a collection of literature more or less permeated with spiritual truth, but spotted throughout with errors not only in

---

**i. e.,* the Third Eye was at the back of the head. The statement that the latest hermaphrodite humanity was "four-armed," unriddles probably the mystery of all the representations and idols of the exoteric Gods of India. On the Acropolis of Argos, there was a ξοανον, a rudely carved wooden statue, attributed to Dædalus, representing a three-eyed colossus, which was consecrated to Zeus Triopes, the "Three-eyed." The head of the "god" has two eyes in its face and one above on the top of the forehead. It is considered the most archaic of all the ancient statues. (*Schol. Vatic. ad Eurip. Troad.,* 14.)

[1]The *inner vision* could henceforth be acquired only through training and initiation, save in the cases of "natural and born magicians"—sensitives and mediums, as they are called now.

[2] This expression "petrified" instead of "ossified" is curious. The "back eye," which is of course the Pineal Gland, so-called, the small pea-like mass of grey nervous matter attached to the back of the third ventricle of the brain, is said to almost invariably contain *mineral concretions* and *sand,* and "nothing more."

minor facts but in the very quintessence of its doctrines; or does it from beginning to end ring with divine authority in all its declarations?

"The churches of God in all ages, the Jewish Church, the early Christian Church, the mediaeval Church, believed, and the great bulk of our churches today believe, the Bible to be the word of God throughout. Union Seminary vigorously denies this. . . .

"The attack on the virgin birth did not begin in New York. There have always been scoffers about it. Voltaire, for instance—Haeckel in our day. It has evidently a direct bearing on the question of the deity of Christ and on the human side of the purity of the Holy Mother.

"Is it any wonder that the General Assembly has specifically declared that no man must be licensed or ordained who is in serious doubt concerning it? A whole school of writers either deny it directly or doubt it. We are rightly jealous of doubt that is the bud that blossoms into denial later . . ."

Just another battle among the "followers," of the meek and lowly Jesus! But does it not seem incredible that any considerably large body of seemingly sane people should busy themselves in a controversy like this when humanity is approaching the greatest crisis of modern times?

"One thing is certain," said a *Sun* writer, "New York Presbytery with its $21,000,000 worth of church property will not be 'kicked out' of the Presbyterian Church."

This prophecy proved a true one, but the general assembly adopted a report warning the New York, and all other Presbyteries, that the tenets of the Church must be accepted by candidates for the ministry before they shall be ordained.

The Presbyterians have been busy in other parts of the country also, if newspaper reports are to be credited. The general assembly of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, held at Birmingham, Alabama, condemned specifically the use of "beer and egg" as a spring tonic—besides accomplishing other undoubtedly valuable work for a waiting world! At another general assembly, in Orlando, Florida, it was decided not to grant women full privileges as deaconesses, but the assembly showed in a long statement of the situation that it was not the desire to restrict the activities of women in the home and foreign mission fields. The assembly already has decided that women should not appear in the pulpit.

What will happen to these children, playing at grown-ups, *when the storm breaks!*

"Souls on Fifth," written by Granville Barker, and appearing in a recent number of *The Century,* is almost too good to talk about. It is as delicate and subtle as its own description of the pathetic little figures, (if that is not too gross a word) that waft through this all too brief story of a life beyond.

It is almost unnecessary to state that to the many the ideas contained in *"Souls on Fifth"* would be "balderdash," that convenient coinage of pomposity! To those who take themselves seriously as Spiritualists, Mr. Barker's ideas would be dampening. He takes such pains to assure us that death in itself cannot confer wisdom and knowledge. He describes that phase of life after death that would correspond to what is known as *kama loka* in Theosophy.

The discovery is made, by a singularly gifted individual, that in the very early dawn of Fifth Avenue, the air is filled with quite a clutter of soft, grayish, formless substances, that prove upon inspection to be the souls of people who hovered in that neighborhood, or longed to hover in

that neighborhood, during earth life. Conversations are held between the individual who still retains his earthly clogs and these souls of Fifth Avenue. In these conversations the author manages to have many a little laugh at us all, to promulgate some interesting speculations and above all he puts over this fact unmistakably—life after death will be just as useless as our life on earth was. Death cannot suddenly change us into wise, noble beings.

Could anyone feel that Mr. Barker deals harshly with the typical successful minister of the Gospel? Even when he is made to say,—

> ". . . And so, after a while I found that I slipped into preaching to my congregation only such sermons as my congregation wanted to hear. What else was to be done? They would not otherwise have come to hear me at all, for there is no law to make them, and nowadays precious little public opinion. . . . It is true that a really strong man in my place might have done better before they turned him out. . . . We had to keep up appearances; the lay patrons of the church expected it. Still we were never seriously in debt. . . . And that, my dear sir, is why we are all here, poor souls. In our lifetime this at its best was all we strove toward, and in our death we have come 'to our own place.'"

One very indignant soul gives utterance thus:—

> "Call this a future life! It's disgraceful. You clergy ought to be ashamed of yourselves. . . . It was a regular religious trust and you know it. Well, I put myself in your hands. Sunday after Sunday I sat under the most sensible of you that I could find. I did what he said about giving money to charity and keeping well out of temptation. I believed all he told me; and now I'm not a bit better off than I was before. You chaps made a contract with me about a future state of bliss, and I expect you to deliver the goods."

The method of conversing with this world of spirits, or souls, as they are more properly called throughout the story, is described in this manner:—

> "I believe that one only instinctively clothed the impressions they conveyed direct to one's mind in the tones of the human voice, and with a very little practice one did not need to do that at all. One could communicate with extraordinary swiftness and ease by imagination alone, talk soul to soul, as it were. It is a simple trick, can be practiced between human beings while on earth, and indeed is the best form of conversation."

Mr. Barker speaks of time as an illusion, and also says, "For as the thing you are in this world stamps itself in time upon your face, so will the things you do stamp themselves forever on your soul."

The climax of the story wherein the poor little soul, conscious of her uselessness, allows herself to be absorbed by one whom she realizes she would help, might symbolize a dawning consciousness of the One Life. It is wiser to say "might," for when one has been held fascinated by the pure cleverness of style that is so beautifully Barkers' own, one is tempted to give him credit for more knowledge, possibly, than he has displayed. He touches not on the subject of reincarnation, but one feels that his not doing so is like ignoring the processes of digestion in ordinary conversation. He must accept it. His poor little souls on Fifth are without this beneficent knowledge; their creator could hardly be so unenlightened.

———

Paul Hyacinthe Loyson, editor-in-chief of *"Le Droit de l'Homme,"* has written an interesting play, *"The Apostle,"* which is translated from the French by Barrett H. Clark. In the central figure, "The Apostle," we have an atheist, one who has cast aside the dogmas of religious thought, who

refuses the superstition of a God who rewards and punishes, and lives a life of self-sacrifice and devotion to his ideals for his country, finding his reward in living up to the dictates of his conscience.

The son, then, has been brought up according to the ideas of his father, and as the tragedy develops, it becomes evident that atheism is not a success with one of his nature; that he is of the order of humans, who, acting from the premise that "life is short, and after death there is nothing, let us be merry while we may," proceeds to live a selfish existence, gratifying every unworthy desire to the fullest extent, without an ounce of consideration for those to whom he owed a sense of duty. When the full depth of his iniquity is revealed, his mother pleads as an excuse for him, that they had given their son over to the forces of evil because they had "taken God away from him"! Because they had kept him from "Christian" prayer! The father answers, "Honor, duty, devotion, they were the living religion I had to give Octave!"

M. Loyson in *"Les Ames Ennemies,"* deals with this same question of religion, or rather, Roman Catholicism versus the so-called scientific view of evolution of matter from form to form: a short term of life in a supposititiously perfect animal form and then—blank. He pictures a man of science enforcing this opinion upon the mind of an immature girl, devoted to the Catholic faith.

No solution is offered in M. Loyson's tragedies for these problems that are vexing the Christian world today.

Solution! What solution could we look for but knowledge? What can lighten the misery of the aching, groaning, sad, old world, but the message that we in our blindness refuse?

Is it possible that M. Loyson has never contacted the Teaching that was brought in 1875? In his wide reading has he ignored completely the masterpieces of the East? If such is his Karma we must feel pity for him. If he has cast aside the divinity of man, reincarnation, and Karma, as not suiting some of his pet ideas, he is again to be pitied. If he has this knowledge as his intelligence would indicate, why not bring it to light?

He dedicates one of his plays, "To those who believe passionately, to those who deny with energy, to those who investigate loyally." That ought to mean something.

The realistic writings of the day have this virtue, at least, they thrill Theosophists with the need of spreading the truth. How can we contemplate the miseries that humanity is bringing upon itself through ignorance, without being fired with the desire for active service in dispelling the clouds that darken the clear vision of man that is his birth-right? There is something positively ghoulish in the way many of our writers of power are exposing all our agonies to the light of day, rubbing on the raw nerves of our sympathies, and telling us of nothing that will help us. If our writers pretend to see nothing between denial absolute of spirit, on the one hand, and on the other, the subjection of spirit under a slavery to priesthood, Theosophists must evoke a different type of literature.

The literature of psycho-analysis has recently been enriched, and enlarged in scope by the publication of Dr. Carl Jung's *"Psychology of the Unconscious,"*—"the Unconscious" here meaning that field of the individual's experience of which he is presently unaware. That this science is growing toward the light has already been evidenced by the fact that hypnotism is no longer considered necessary in its investigations, and that the analysis of dreams, as the most completely untrammeled expression of the individual, is given due consideration. Dr. Jung's book even gives the hope that the long wished for day has dawned, when science may become warm-hearted enough to work for humanity—to teach it how to eradicate wrong bodily ideas, and rightly use god-given functions.

Psycho-analysis has its place among all therapeutic agencies, but it should be studied and used only by those whose especial business it is to give aid to such unfortunates as hysteriacs, epileptics, and other classes of neurotics. What healthy normal person would think of sitting down to read a "doctor's book," without some very special definite purpose? Would he be interested, except with a definite motive, to study all recorded cases of surgery, to live at a hospital where he could be in close touch with afflicted people? Yet, he can be grateful that hospitals and surgery exist for the relief of those who need them! So many people scorn the "old" ideas—the psychology that was perfected in India thousands of years ago—to bow down before the modern scientific psychology because it is "new." They prefer to run morbidly after these books on psycho-analysis, which compare with the rich treasures of the old Aryan psychology much as a "doctor's book" compares with the universal laws of health!

Dr. Beatrice Hinkle's Introduction to her translation of Dr. Jung's book (Moffatt, Yard & Co.) gives an admirable survey of its spirit and matter. It is to be highly commended to those who want a general idea of the subject of psycho-analysis. Dr. Hinkle credits Prof. Freud, of Vienna, for the first enunciation of the theory that the origin of various symptoms in hysteriacs and neurotics lies in unfulfilled desires and wishes, unexpressed and unknown to the patient—which theory has "led to a new evaluation of the whole conduct of human life." That criticism and opposition have developed even among its exponents so far as to make two distinct schools—the Freud school of Vienna, the Jung school of Zurich—is lively evidence of the real value of the theory. Certainly psycho-analysis requires very special knowledge and discrimination of its operators, and it must be very disturbing to reject ideas, held by humanity for ages, in favor of the verification of the statement that there is no such thing as chance and that every act and every expression has its own meaning, determined by the inner feelings and wishes of the individual. As Dr. Hinkle says, "It is not a simple matter to come out boldly and state that every individual is to a large extent the determiner of his own destiny, for only by poets and philosophers has this idea been put forth—not by science" . . . Later she adds that the Freudian psychology seems to belong to that conception of Max Müller's—"An empirical acquaintance with facts rises to a scientific knowledge of facts as soon as the mind discovers beneath the multiplicity of single productions the unity of an organic system." Law and unity as psychological bases! Are we not getting on?

Dr. Hinkle gives some time to differentiating between the Freud and the Jung teaching. Prof. Freud found all neurotic symptoms arising from the sexual constitution—the sexual and psychic life being closely interwoven. Dr. Jung finds the primal instinct of reproduction the basis of many functions and activities, but sees sexuality as *a* channel occupied by *libido*—not the only one. He sees man using instinctively a living power in all the automatic processes of his functioning—but that man through his understanding and intelligence has the power consciously to direct and use his *libido* in definite and desired ways—that is, it may be spiritualized.

Does not that hint broadly at the theosophic teaching—man is not any of his bodies or passions or desires, but verily, the one who uses all? Does it not also glimpse the dual nature of *Buddhi*—the same power used for high or low?

Dr. Jung does not ask about the psychic experiences of the childhood of his patient—but what is the present duty or task he is avoiding, what obstacle he is now unable to overcome, the *cause* of regression to past experience. He wants the real motive behind every act, and his psychology rejects all judgment from surface thought.

The most valuable of all Dr. Jung's ideas, to our mind, is that in man's privilege as a self-creator his highest purpose is found; life is his to use for

construction or destruction, and he has placed upon himself tremendous ar unnecessary burdens. Here is Karma applied to one life—

> "All that total of a soul
> Which is the things it did, the thoughts it had."

Does it seem a far cry to the time when such a psychologist may find in "th sub-conscious mind" records of another past than that of the present pe sonal life?

Psycho-analysis and surgery aim at parallel results; psycho-analysis a surgery of the personality. It can not be claimed to create wonderf persons, or geniuses, suggests Dr. Hinkle, but it can help heal some woun of the soul; it can remove some inhibitions, by an understanding of lif by establishing, from a biological point of view, a clear conception of th actual human relationship—the brotherhood of all mankind.

Certainly, psycho-analysis demonstrates the power of man's thoug and his responsibility,—though only Karma and Reincarnation can ev make possible a full explanation of man's paramount power over his ow destiny.

If Theosophists knew their philosophy, and studied the available wri ings of H. B. Blavatsky, whom all acknowledge as the Messenger, the inco sistencies in speech and action so apparent within theosophical ranks wou soon be done away with. A correspondent recently asked us if we "stoo for H. P. Blavatsky or Wm. Q. Judge. We replied that we "stood" for bot that H. P. B. "stood" for W. Q. J. first, last and all the time—so if o "stood" for *her,* he must necessarily "stand" for W. Q. J. Our correspon ent then proceeded to point out what seemed to her an inconsistency betwe the teachings of these Two, evidencing thereby her own misunderstandi of H. P. B., and a habit of *surface* study; and then condemned W. Q. For the benefit of all Theosophists who may read these words we repri a portion of a letter written years ago by H. P. Blavatsky, and lat printed in the Second Volume of *"Letters That Have Helped Me,"* (p. 110 The existence of the original of this letter can be attested by at least o Theosophist of our acquaintance, who has seen and handled it. She wrot

"In answer to your letter I can only say as follows: If W. Q. Judg the man who has done most for Theosophy in America, who has work most unselfishly in your country, and has ever done the biddings of Mast the best he knew how, is left alone in . . . and if the . . . Socie in general and its Esotericists especially leave him alone, without th unanimous *moral support,* which is much more than their money—then I s —let them go! They are No theosophists;—and if such a thing shou happen, and Judge be left to fight his battles alone, then shall I bid all them an eternal good-bye. I swear on MASTER's holy name to shake off t dust of my feet from everyone of them . . .", etc.

It is quite evident from the above that H. P. B. "stood" for Wm. Judge. She makes quite evident also the position She took towards all th (Esotericists especially) who would not "stand" for him. Now what is t *present* application of this letter? That it has a present application will admitted by every Theosophist who reverences H. P. B., because all su realize that She wrote no idle phrase, and that *all* her writings were set do for the time to come. The present application is that H. P. B. still "stan for W. Q. J., and that Theosophists who would "stand" for her, yet "stand" for him, have quite misunderstood, and thereby set in motion Karma that removes them from the sphere and influence of the Teac they say they so revere. "I swear on MASTER's holy name to shake off dust of my feet from everyone of them . . .," wrote H. P. B. Can take a *part* of her message, and reject a part? Or did She mean just w She said?